Theological Magazine

OF THE

EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA

Volume 62 May, 1934 Number 3

Motto: 1. *Cor.* 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at Saint Louis, Missouri, as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Reign of God, H. Sander 161
Religion among Convicts, Dr. J. Ernst 174
Schleiermacher's Ethics, Elmer Arndt 183
Homiletische Lage. Dr. H. Werdermann 188
Bibelkritik. Dr. G. Schuette 200
Editorials 207
Christian World 216
Book Review 230

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per copy (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.

Volume 62 | St. Louis, Mo. | May 1, 1934

THE REIGN OF GOD AND THE WORK OF MAN

Rev. H. Sander

The modern theological movement in Germany commonly known in America as Barthianism or Crisis Theology, has been severely criticized for having dealt inadequately with the problem of Christian ethics. And yet one of the first and permanent interests of its leaders—Barth, Brunner, Gogarten—has been the ethical problem. Barth makes it clear that as soon as we ask the question: "What shall we do?" we have struck at the heart of ethics. And that question is inescapable. He who seeks to escape it, is answering it by his very refusal to face it.

The religious man in particular, whatever his theology may be, must take the question of ethical decision seriously. For what a man does is obviously the only true test of the sincerity of his faith. Ethics is applied religion. Both the Crisis theologians and those who criticize the deficiencies of the movement from the ethical viewpoint, are agreed that ethics is central to Christian Theology. Where then, does the point of divergence lie?

Modern liberal theology has held that man's efforts to do the good have some relation to his salvation, and contribute to the increasing actualization of God's will upon earth. Barth also stresses the necessity of doing God's will but denies that it has any relation to human salvation either in time or eternity. Neither is man by doing God's will in any way cooperating with Him to bring in the Kingdom. From the liberal point of view man is saved because he does the will of God; from the Barthian standpoint he does the will of God *because* he is saved. The new thing in Christianity, according to Barth, is the righteousness which the believer

has in Christ as his starting point and not as the goal of his journey. The liberal holds that man's ethical conduct is a necessary condition for the final triumph of the Reign of God; the Barthian's conception of the Reign of God is completely eschatological. It is breaking in, and will continue to break in, no matter what man does about it. The typical liberal has his feet firmly planted in this world. He is no mere pilgrim here. The eternal world is not set over against the temporal world. It is either a continuation of it or completely bound up with it. Consequently God is immanent in this world and His purposes are conditioned by man's moral defeats and triumphs. Salvation (if the term is used at all) is a process of personal character development and social progress. The will of God is not so much revealed as it is discovered. The Reign (or Kingdom) of God is conceived as the ideal moral society which is being progressively achieved largely by man's own efforts. It is still God's Kingdom in name and has His "moral support" but its ultimate fate depends upon man.

How different is the world of the Barthian! For him there is a complete break between this temporal world and the eternal world. God is transcendent and self-sufficient. Although He breaks into time continually, he is not part of it. The ravages of Sin have left a deep chasm between man and God over which only He can throw a bridge. But it can remain only a one-way bridge—from God to man. Man stands condemned under the judgment of a Holy God until God reveals to him the hope of salvation. But salvation is not an ethical character to which man can lift himself by his own boot-straps; it is a gift of Divine grace offered to him as a hope for the world beyond death. The Kingdom of God is not an ethical society cooperatively built by God and man but it is a breaking through of the eternal world into the world of time.

Both of these approaches are inadequately, and, perhaps, somewhat unfairly presented here. But they show in this contradictory form where the main issue lies. To follow one viewpoint to its logical end will lead to an extreme anthropocentrism—modern humanism; the other way leads back to an equally one-sided theism. If you insist too emphatically that men are indispensable agents of the process of world transformation in accordance with the Divine will, you place the final responsibility in man's hands, and make the outcome problematical. The issue turns upon man. Take the other extreme and pronounce the activities of men irrelevant to the actualization of God's will and you may paralyze human effort. Since it is entirely "up to God" why concern ourselves very greatly about ethics?

Poetical expression has been given to these two different directions of thought in the following two quotations. Edwin Markham in his "Earth Is Enough" turns his eyes earthward and cuts away the distinction between time and eternity:

"We men of earth have here the stuff
Of Paradise—we have enough!
We need no other stones to build
The stairs into the Unfulfilled—
No other ivory for the doors—
No other marble for the floors—
No other cedar for the beam
And dome of man's immortal dream.
Here on the paths of every-day—
Here on the common human way—
Is all the busy gods would take
To build a Heaven, to mold and make
New Edens. Ours the task sublime
To build eternity in time!"

This is a good example of the ethical optimism of early Twentieth Century religious liberalism. How presumptuous it sounds within this present decade of ethical chaos and disillusionment! Much more consonant with the religious spirit of the present is the sonnet of John Milton on his blindness:

". . . . God doth not need
Either man's work, or His own gifts; who best
Bear His mild yoke, they serve Him best.
His state
Is kingly. Thousands at His bidding speed,
And post o'er land and ocean without rest;
They also serve who only stand and wait."

Can the modern Christian take either alternative? Must ethical earnestness, on the one hand, involve an optimistic faith in human self-sufficiency, and a giving up of a firm faith in Divine initiative? Or, on the other hand, can the Christian of today trust in "The Destiny that shapes our ends" without unconcernedly reclining on his couch while the social-ethical battle rages about him?

Perhaps light can be thrown upon this problem by a consideration of the Kingdom of God idea, about which the whole question of God's initiative and mans' activity seems to have revolved in Christian history? What does this concept mean to the modern Christian? What different meanings has the term "Kingdom of God" had historically? Is it still a valid rallying point for Christian ethics? If so, how ought we to use the term in our preaching, teaching and acting today? First let us take an historical survey.

The Kingdom of God Idea in Its Beginning

The Kingdom of God idea has appeared in some form or another in all Christian history. It has probably been the most general conception of the goal or highest good of Christian ethics, and has served as a mold into which men have poured all sorts of ethical and social programs since the time of Jesus. And although Christians today commonly associate the term with Jesus, it was used long before he lived.

The entire story of the Hebrews is colored by this conception. And, in a sense, as Professor E. F. Scott suggests, the Kingdom in one form or another lies at the heart of every religion.* Men have usually had the vision of a great end in which all things will ultimately find consummation and perfection.

The actual term "Kingdom of God" is not found in the Old Testament, but the idea is everywhere present. Jehovah is King—the One true God who will finally make himself known to all people. Thus already in the Old Testament there is a double aspect to the conception. On the one hand God is already King over all the world and governs it according to His righteous will. On the other hand God's kingship still lies in the future when not only Israel, but all nations and all nature will recognize his sovereignty, and "the wolf will lie down with the lamb."

This dual Hebrew conception was later greatly influenced by contact with Persian thought. And out of the combination of these two strains arose the apocalyptic literature of the period from 200 B. C. to 100 A. D. Unlike the great prophets who had found some relations between God's will and the immediate social situation, the apocalyptists fixed their attention upon the future age. Examples of this fantastic literature may be found in the canonical book of Daniel and in the apocryphal books of Enoch, and 4th Esdras.

Since this apocalyptic literature acrose out of a time of disillusionment and projected hope, it was quite natural that it should transform the conception of the Kingdom of God from an earthly, ethical society to that of a completely changed world. This new world was to be catastrophically brought in by God's Messiah (Son of Man in Daniel) who would transform it into an earthly paradise.

The apocalyptic and traditional conceptions were intermingled as time went on. The popular mind frequently confused the ethical Kingdom with political aspirations. The expected Messiah, it was hoped, would be a political champion of Israel against the hated Roman.

---

* E. F. Scott—"Kingdom of God," p. 12.

To this welter of ideas and hopes concerning the future of Israel Jesus fell heir. It was not by accident that he chose the idea of the Kingdom of God as the vessel for his religious mesage.

Jesus' View of the Kingdom

The attempt to press Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God into a traditional historical mold have met with repeated failure. His utterances on the subject can hardly be forced into consistency with any existing system or scheme. Although he used forms taken over from Jewish tradition, he poured into them the new content of his own experience of God and his ethical insights.

When we come to ask just what Jesus meant by the Kingdom we are confronted by a different problem. He never defined it. If he had one, clear, consistent idea of it, the Gospel writers certainly do not give it to us. For this reason the Christian Church, since the time of Jesus, has been able to read a variety of meanings into Jesus' conception of the term. In fact most later conceptions have arisen because some certain aspect of Jesus' teaching concerning the Kingdom was taken as central and adapted to the contemporary situation.

As we examine the various aspects of Jesus' teaching on the Kingdom, certain basic ideas emerge. In the first place the Kingdom is really God's Kingdom. The initiative for bringing it in is in God's hands. Men are powerless to bring it in. They may prepare for it, and hasten its coming, but God himself must initiate it.

In the second place Jesus' sayings as a whole, point to the consummation of the Kingdom as future. But that does not mean that God is not now reigning in the world. He watches over the sparrows and clothes the lilies of the field. He is a living all-sustaining presence. Thus it might not be entirely beside the point to distinguish between the present reign of God and the future Kingdom of God. The future consummation will gather up and perfect what has been and now is. The present is significant because it symbolizes what shall be.

In the third place the Kingdom is a moral order. Although under present earthly conditions the Absolute ethical demands of the Kingdom can only be imperfectly actualized, they are nevertheless unconditional demands. As a preparation for the age that is to come men must understand the moral demands of the Will of God. These Jesus gave to us as he saw them, in his ethical teachings One need not agree here with the "interims ethic" theory of the Eschatological school. The motivating principles of Jesus' ethic such as love, faithfulness, etc., were not meant to hold good only for a short time until the Kingdom would break in. They were the very essence of the Kingdom and must be carried out now amidst

the difficulties of an imperfect world. Jesus taught men what the moral law of the Kingdom would be, and how men must strive to bring themselves into harmony with it even now—as a preparation for its consummation.

And finally the Kingdom, in the view of Jesus, is an eschatological breaking in of something new. It is a "revolution" and not a gradual, evolutionary growth within the present world. Jesus envisaged no future church, though such an interpretation was given to some of his parables and sayings by the Gospel writers. Jesus does seem to have modified the apocalyptic insistence upon the instantaneous nature of the Kingdom's coming by allowing for a period of preparation. The parable of the mustard seed does not represent a long process of growth, but a springing up in a single season. But however sudden the Kingdom's coming was to be, according to Jesus' view, most New Testament scholars are agreed that he did not anticipate a Kingdom which would grow through an age-long process.

Why is it, then, that most modern Christians have come to take the evolutionary point of view? The historical development of the idea is, of course, a long one. It can only be briefly sketched here. But let us take a rapid glance at the fate of the Kingdom of God idea as it was adapted to the historical situations of Christian history.

The Kingdom from Jesus to the Reformation

When, after Jesus had passed from the scene, and the apocalyptic consummation of the Kingdom had not taken place, it was quite natural that Jesus' sayings about it should have been transferred completely to the early Christian Community. This shifting from the apocalyptic to the ecclesiastical interpretation already takes place in Paul. Both conceptions may be found in his Epistles. In some epistles the Kingdom is the reign of God in which all things will be transformed and the righteous will enter into their inheritance. (Gal. 5: 20-21, 1 Cor. 6: 9ff., 1 Cor. 15: 50) But at other places Paul speaks of God's servants as constituting the Kingdom now. (Col. 1: 13-18, Romans 14: 17)

As the church grew in strength and prestige the tendency increased to think of the Kingdom in relation to the Church. To be baptized into it meant to become a member of the Kingdom. But due to the persistent influence of the Revelation of St. John, with its emphasis upon the Second Coming and the Millennial reign of Christ, the consummation of the Kingdom was identified with this Millennial period for the first four stormy centuries of Christian history. The period of persecution directed the hopes of Christians to the future world. But after the church had gloriously survived

the persecutions, the millennial hope gradually dwindled, and by the time of Augustine it came to its end.

Although Augustine in his early thinking still retained a shred of millenniarism from his theological heritage, he definitely abandoned it later. In its place he put the twofold conception of the Kingdom of Christ *now,* and the Reign of God *hereafter.* The Catholic Church now became the Kingdom of Christ—the visible representative of the perfect Kingdom of God in the hereafter. Augustine usually meant by the church, not the external organization but the sum total of predestined believers. It is in this sense that he meant to identify it with the Kingdom of Christ. But as Augustine in his writing constantly alternated these two conceptions of the church, it became easy for the later church to make the identity between the Kingdom of God and the ecclesiastical hierarchy complete.

The Kingdom from the Reformation to Barth

The conception of the Kingdom of God as an omnipotent church was carried through the Middle Ages and remains the theory of the Roman Catholic Church today. This secularization of what had originally been a religious concept, took the weight (figuratively speaking) off God's side of the scales and placed it on the human side. It was still the Kingdom of God in name, but its real fate was now in the hands of His earthly, ecclesiastical representatives.

In practise, however, the hope of the Kingdom as an omnipotent, universal Church had already begun to weaken on the eve of the Reformation. The increasing disunity of the Catholic Church had been a fact to which the Reformation only gave definite expression.

The Reformers said very little about the Kingdom of God. Their utterances on the subject usually had some reference to the church. They did not deviate far from the Catholic conception except that they laid more emphasis upon the invisible than on the visible church.

It was with Albrecht Ritschl that the more biblical and social idea of the Kingdom of God was made central again in Christian thought. To be sure Emmanuel Kant had perceived the importance of ethics for the Kingdom of God as an association of men bound together by the laws of virtue. And Schleiermacher thought of the Kingdom as the Christian Community, standing as the goal of a long process of increasing God-consciousness. But Ritschl made the Kingdom of God the focal point of his doctrinal system.

According to Ritschl's view of the Kingdom it is not to be identified with the Church as organization. Going back to the New Testament, he sought to understand what Jesus had meant by the

term. He found that Jesus considered himself the founder of a moral fellowship, bound together by love. Ritschl, of course, minimizes the eschatological parts of Jesus' utterances on the subject. The Christian Community was to be set up in the present world. It is a growing thing. The ultimate inclusion of the whole world in this moral fellowship is the goal of history. To quote from Ritschl's own words:

"The creation of the fellowship of love among men, accordingly, is not merely the goal of the world, but at the same time the completed revelation of God Himself, beyond which none other and none higher can be conceived."*

Ritschl considered the church as the Kingdom only in so far as it helped to realize the moral ideal. Only through the practise of love in the growing Christian Community are men helping to hasten the complete realization of the Kingdom of God which is now only here in part.

What is to be said concerning Ritschl's point of view? Certainly it had a tremendous influence in turning the whole stream of theological thought into the modern liberal channel, so well known to all of us. Ritschl helped to remove the Kingdom of God idea from too close a relation with the church as an institution. He put back into it the social-ethical content that it had with Jesus. But he was not so successful in preserving its religious content. By eliminating the eschatological element of the concept he took the emphasis from God and placed it upon man.

Perhaps it ought to be said in fairness to Ritschl that he did not intend that the Kingdom of God idea should sacrifice its theistic basis for an ethical one; but such a tendency was almost inevitable when his treatment of the subject was adapted to the historical situation of his day. He played directly into the hands of the 19th century movement toward secularization and liberalism. Biblical critics were reducing the historical Jesus to an ethical genius. The rising influence of the theory of evolution awakened an ethical optimism in religious souls. The Kingdom of God concept could now be given the support of a scientific theory. It could be made the goal not only of human history but of the whole cosmic process.

In the economic sphere the socialist revolt against capitalism was beginning to take shape. This gave a new incentive to make the Kingdom a practical working program among the laboring classes. But at the same time Marxist theory had a sort of secular eschatology which should have been a warning to Christian Kingdom enthusiasts not to forget the original eschatology of their own movement.

---

* A. Ritschl—"Justification and Reconciliation," p. 291.

Aside from his interest in the Christian Community, Ritschl, in his interpretation of the Kingdom, had given the moral regeneration of the individual much more prominence than the transformation of the social order. His immediate followers staid pretty close to that position. Harnack, for instance, states that the parables of Jesus on the Kingdom are concerned only with "God and the Soul, with the Soul and its God."*

But the Christian-socialist movement in Germany, and a parallel movement in England which entered the field during the last decade of the 19th century, began to turn the attention of Christians to the social interpretation of the Kingdom. It was not enough to build a community of morally regenerated individuals. The social order was a corrupt matrix which had to be transformed so that moral individuals could grow up in it. One branch of the Christian-socialists which was called the Religiös-Soziale Bund, was particularly active in aiding the cause of labor. Led by such men as Hermann Kutter and Leonhardt Ragaz, it definitely linked itself with the Socialist party in Germany and Switzerland. These men interpreted Marxian socialism religiously. They saw it as a revival of the Kingdom of God hope—a sort of John the Baptist which was preparing the way for the Kingdom to come.

In the first decade of the 20th century the results were quite encouraging. It really looked as if at last the true meaning of the Kingdom had been discovered. The secular movements for social justice seemed to be working directly toward the religious hope for the Kingdom of God on earth. Men gave themselves with feverish enthusiasm to the cause, and in their optimism readily identified the Kingdom with the social program which they were carrying out.

"We were concerned about a 'Christian Revolution'. But we had no illusions that this revolution was something which we could achieve with our own spirit, our preaching, our action, or even through Socialism. It remained exclusively God's work. We have never understood it differently. That is, of course, contrary to the common unfounded opinion that we had thought to build the Kingdom of God by our own actions, or by socialist or pacifist politics. We merely realized the necessity of this revolution and we believed to have seen God at work bringing it about; but the most that we could do was to prepare the way!"*

Although the leaders of the movement may have had a clear understanding of the difference between their work of preparation for the Kingdom, and God's actual initiation of it, it became quite easy for the average Christian to overlook the distinction. At least

* Harnack—"Wesen des Christentums," p. 36.

* Reich Gottes, Marxismus, Sozialismus"—edited by Georg Wunsch Article by Leonhardt Ragaz.

this is what happened in the parallel Social Gospel movement in America.

It will not be necessary to say much about this movement here. Most of us are acquainted with it through experience. We grew up in its exhilarating atmosphere. Largely through the untiring efforts of Walter Rauschenbusch, its most prominent figure, the movement quickly took hold here and penetrated the denominational walls of the greater part of American Protestantism. It saved the church from social sterility in an individualistic age. "Build the Kingdom of God on earth!" became the watchword. Since the movement was not so closely bound up with the socialist party as the Religious-socialists were in Germany, it was less radical. By refusing to enter the class struggle it remained more religious in tenor but at the same time became less realistic. It more easily made a complete identification between the Kingdom of God and the social order to be organized on the basis of love. Ethical enthusiasm and optimism ran even higher than in Germany. To love God meant nothing more than to love your fellowman. The City of God was to be erected on earth and its construction was in the hands of men.

Gospel interpretation was completely revised. The eschatological elements in Jesus' sayings were ignored. Salvation of the individual through justification was rejected as outworn theology and replaced by the hope in a gradually growing Kingdom of love among men, within which men could be morally "saved." It was not so much a Kingdom of God as a "Democracy of God and Man."

This conception of the Kingdom is still the dominant one in our churches today. Out of the ranks of the Social Gospel adherents have grown up its own critics; but, shorn of its naive optimism, it is still the keynote of Protestant theology here. The effect of the war and its economic aftermath was not so devastating to our nation as to completely submerge the hope for a more Christian social order. We may well be thankful that the reaction was not so severe here, as to endanger the social emphasis in Christian ethics.

Germany was not so fortunate! The economic and political collapse was so complete there that a severe reaction was inevitable. The hopes for the realization of an earthly Kingdom of God were blasted. The Socialist party, including the religious-socialists, could not hold to their pacifist principles, and were swept into the international conflict. After the war came a period of pessimism and disillusionment. The forces working for social reconstruction gradually capitulated to the forces of reaction.

Out of the wrecks of this post-war disillusionment arose a re-

ligious reaction, the *Barthian theology*. It gave theological expression to the judgment that history had already pronounced.

Karl Barth and several of his cohorts had been members of the Religious-socialist movement with Ragaz and Kutter. They had been ardent workers for what they then believed to be the cause of the Kingdom of God. But upon the outbreak of the war, Barth, who was then a preacher, was compelled to seek a firmer ground for his message than the crumbling hope for an external Kingdom. He turned to his Bible. In the Epistle to the Romans he found a "strange new world," and with his commentary on this Epistle he began a movement that ran down the tattered flag of human self-sufficiency from theology and hoisted the banner of the Absolute transcendent God.

Space does not permit a treatment of the theology of the movement here. Suffice it to say that it set itself definitely against every interpretation of the Kingdom of God which made it dependent upon human activity. Barth and his friends proclaimed that the judgment of God was upon all man's efforts to save himself. Only as he gives up his self-sufficiency and puts his faith in the initiative of God again, can the Kingdom really "come." It is desecrating God's name to identify our feeble social and moral efforts with his Kingdom. The Kingdom is not an immanent growth within the world of time, but an eschatological breaking in of the eternal world; it is not an external social structure, but a spiritual hope.

And thus we have concluded our historical pilgrimage with the Kingdom of God idea. It has made almost a complete circle of interpretation since Jesus' time. In Jesus the essential elements: the Divine initiative, eschatological inception, and social-ethical nature, of the Kingdom of God had been closely interwoven. But after him, each meaning given to the concept lacked either one or two of the essentials of Jesus' view. The ecclesiastical interpretation was a direct reaction to that of apocalyptic eschatology. But it in turn minimized Divine initiative and weakened the social aspect into an external organization. The liberal interpretation completely rejected the eschatological aspect of the Kingdom and gradually placed its fate into the hands of men. And now the Barthians restore to it its theistic and eschatological basis, but are in danger of minimizing its social-ethical significance.

The Kingdom of God Today

How, then, shall we use the term in our Christian preaching and teaching today? Perhaps it is possible to regain the essential meaning that Jesus gave to the Kingdom of God without retaining the particular historical form in which he thought of it.

The writer is not a Barthian, but he feels that they are right in condemning the liberal tendency to take the Kingdom out of God's hands and linking its fate with human programs—either ecclesiastical or social. Such a view may have accorded with the optimistic age of progress up to the war (and shortly after in our country). But in a time of economic and political upheaval like the present, we realize that a surer foundation is needed for our faith than the frail efforts of man.

The age of evolutionary optimism is past! Our fond hopes of building our own social and economic Tower of Babel to Heaven have proven but an idle dream. The present state of the world seems to be God's judgment upon our egotism and self-sufficiency—we who thought to build our own paradise on earth.

The Barthians are pointing out that God must be taken seriously once more. We need again, a transcendent reference for our total life and thought today. It is not necessary to hold with Barth that God speaks to us only through the inspired words of the Bible and the preached word. He also speaks to us through the historical events of the present. The catastrophes of history are his words of judgment upon a world that has withdrawn itself from Him in arrogance and pride. If man does not come out of his finite shell of self-sufficiency, God will have to break it.

There is also a note of truth in the Barthian substitution of the eschatological for the evolutionary method of Divine operation. It may be that God fulfills his purposes not so much through an immanent evolutionary growth, as through sudden crisis. Not only through ordered progress does God reveal his Kingdom but through apparent catastrophe. An economic collapse may be both God's judgment upon one age and a preparation for the next.

It were better if we, who call ourselves Christians, spoke less of *helping* to *build* the Kingdom of God, and did more about preparing the age in which we live for its coming. We ministers speak so glibly of doing "Kingdom work" when we are frantically trying to balance our church budgets. We see the deacons on Sunday morning bringing up a few plates full of nickels and dimes and call it "building the Kingdom of God." What a weak significance for a term that to Jesus meant something tremendous and catastrophic! —the divine transformation of a world! If we are going to use the term at all let us not take the fire out of it by using it as a vague, general title for every little welfare program. If it is really God's Kingdom then it will come even if the Christian Church as an institution should perish from the earth. It may even be that much of what we are doing ostensibly to "build" the Kingdom, is actually hindering its coming.

But this brings us back to our original dilemma. What is man's place in this Kingdom to be initiated by God? Are our ethical efforts so futile that there is nothing we can do about it? Does faith in God's initiative involve quietistic inaction on the part of man?

Most emphatically not! It did not mean that to Jesus. Because he felt the coming of the Kingdom to be in God's hands he worked all the harder to announce and prepare for its coming! The Barthians as they are developing the ethical implications of their theological position, are not preaching ethical quietism, even though the logic of their theology is leading reactionary souls in that direction. They deny that man's ethical efforts have any ultimate value; but they insist that it is the will of God that we take seriously our share of the life of society. We must set ourselves against the political and social evils of our day,—not because we are laying bricks for the City of God—but because we are constrained to give active expression to the faith that we have in a righteous God to whom we pray: "*Thy* Kingdom *come! Thy will* be done on earth as it is in heaven!"

The modern Christian needs to have no illusions about the civilization of which he is a part. With open eyes he will face its injustices and vices. If he does this he will know what the ethics of the Social Gospel has emphasized—that he is part of an appalling network of collective sin. He cannot escape part responsibility for it unless he removes himself from the world. But he can, and must protest with all his strength against the kind of society that is forcing him to compromise his principles in order to live. Even more realistically and enthusiastically than the protagonist of the Social Gospel, he will protest against a capitalism that is built upon greed, and the rising tide of nationalism that is based upon selfish pride and racial prejudice. He will look upon them as parts of a civilization that must pass, for they stand in judgment before a righteous God.

More constructively the Christian can work with the fellowship of believers in church and society to prepare the way for a better civilization to come. He will do this because he has the firm faith that though civilizations may fail, the Kingdom of God can never fail with them, for it is in the keeping of One who suffers with us but who can bring order into the chaos of man's stupidities and sin.

RELIGION AMONG CONVICTS

JOHN L. ERNST, PH.D.

As indicated by the almost complete absence of literature on this subject, it is evident that writers and research workers are too busy with other phases and aspects of this fascinating subject of Criminology and Penology to find time or to become sufficiently interested to break soil in this new field. Because every upright and law-abiding citizen is actually a potential criminal, there is no dearth of general interest in the offender, the criminal or the convict. An additional reason for this interest lies in the fact that crime constitutes one of the few points at which it becomes necessary for the group to deal drastically with the troublesome individual. The convict serves furthermore as an interesting accessory, a scapegoat by means of which we members of the righteous group bolster up our comforting holier-than-thou attitude and thus hold intact our own assurances of special respectability. Consequently the literature of this field deals as a rule with the relationships as they exist only between society as a whole and the offending individual thus disregarding the relations existent between the latter and his God.

This subject "Religion Among Convicts" is fraught with difficulties. The definition of the term "crime," for example, has varied greatly from time to time and from place to place. One definition current at present, runs as follows: "A crime is an act forbidden and punished by law, which is almost always immoral according to the prevailing standard, which is usually harmful to society, which it is ordinarily feasible to repress by penal measures, and whose repression is necessary or is supposed to be necessary to the preservation of the existing social order."[1] Accordingly an individual accused of crime, tried in a recognized tribunal, and finally convicted, becomes the "convict." As we now look back upon the past we feel constrained to concede that frequently the individual on trial was more upright in the truth and religion than his accusers—the group.

Another difficulty is encountered in the search for a satisfactory definition of the term "religion." This is attested also by one research worker in this field who has summed up the situation in the following terms: "The truth is, I suppose, that 'religion' is one of those general and popular terms which have been used for centuries to cover so vague and indefinite a collection of phenomena that no definition can be framed which will include all its uses and coincide with every one's meaning for it. Hence all definitions of religion are more or less arbitrary and should be taken rather as postulates than axioms. In this sense I shall myself propose a tentative

[1] Parmelee, Maurice, Ph.D. Criminology, p. 32.

definition of religion, not at all as a final or complete statement, nor because I think it of any great importance, but because I intend to write a book about religion and it therefore seems only fair that I should tell the reader in advance not what the word means, but what I am going to mean by the word.

"The definition which I propose is the following: Religion is the serious and social attitude of individuals or communities toward the power or powers which they conceive as having ultimate control over their interests and destinies."[2] This same difficulty has been recognized by others, for example, Professor James H. Leuba of Bryn Mawr College has compiled forty-eight definitions from as many great men. He then adds two more of his own evidently to fill out the even half hundred. In the light of the foregoing it is only self-evident that the topic "Religion Among Convicts" must necessarily present difficulties great in numbers as well as in scope.

History of This Problem of Research

Several years ago the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania, located at Pittsburgh, underwent one of the recurrent changes, or reforms so called, that enter the history of almost every penal institution in our country. At that time a modernized program and a new personnel were brought into the picture. The new deal, as demanded, included a replacement of the alleged brutal treatment of the inmates by a humane and sympathetic policy, a new intramural school system, and a rather extensive program of collaboration on the part of the Department of Psychology of the University of Pittsburgh.

The writer of these lines was at that time numbered among the graduate students of the Department of Psychology in question and was therefore granted the welcome opportunity to participate in the proposed psychological and psychiatric investigation of convicts. This new work was launched under the guidance of Dr. William T. Root, Jr., who had previously done special research work at the Leland Stanford University of California and is at present the Dean of the Department of Psychology at the University of Pittsburgh. Nevertheless the work of testing convicts and criminals was then still so new as to render necessary a considerable amount of reconnoitering and casting about in attempting to determine just what type of tests would yield desired results.

When finally the actual work of investigation was begun it embraced a series of tests the majority of which needed to be given individually which means that each psychologist interviewed only one convict at a time, thus devoting a total of from eight to twelve

[2] Pratt, James Bissett, Ph.D. The Religious Consciousness, p. 1, ff.

hours to each inmate examined. Under careful supervision forty different examiners co-operated in this single test survey and when it was finally completed it was found that the total number of hours consumed was considerably above the nineteen thousand mark. This amount of work would have been sufficient to keep one tester busy eight hours per day throughout the entire year and for a period of more than seven years. The voluminous results thus obtained are presented by Dr. William T. Root, Jr., in book form bearing the title: "A Psychological and Educational Survey of 1916 Prisoners in the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania."

While participating in the work mentioned above the writer was repeatedly tempted to depart from the regular pathway of the sociological, psychological and psychiatric examining and branch out into the field of the religious life of the examinees. The opportunity later presented itself in connection with the quest for research materials for the thesis requirements for a degree of Docor of Philosophy. In order to restrict the field and make the problem somewhat specific, the following was finally adopted: "An Analysis of the Religious and Ethical Habits of a Group of Convicts." Because of the limited space here available the reader will kindly accept the following as an abstract taken from certain parts of the thesis proper.

The Unethical and Immoral, a Concern of All Religionists

"Originally ethics has no existence apart from religion . . ."[3] However, pertaining to their modus operandi, "One striking difference between morality and religion lise in the fact that religion involves a wider outlook. It scans a more distant horizon. It is concerned with the cosmic fortunes of good and evil. While morality springs chiefly from man's relation to his fellows, religion has its source primarily in the relation which man sustains to nature, to the totality of those forces by which he is surrounded."[4] Accordingly in modern usage we find: "The term moral has been used to designate those ideals which pertain particularly to human social welfare, in distinction from the claims of religion which seeks authority . . . for conduct in the will of a deity. The contrast between moral and religious conduct belongs to that conception of the world which makes a rigid distinction between the natural and the supernatural, between human and divine."[5]

The majority of past and present religions of the world reveal a consciousness of the need of dealing with anti-social and offending individuals. In the Zend-Avesta of the Parsees is found an entire

[3] Spencer, The Principles of Ethics, p. 307.
[4] Everett, Moral Values, p. 380.
[5] Ames, The Psychology of Religious Experience, p. 285.

chapter devoted to "Contracts and Outrages" in which definite rules are laid down for the punishment of those guilty of grave offenses. The conclusion includes the comforting after-thought, that "they shall thenceforth in their doings walk after the way of holiness." Hammurabi is shown in the act of receiving from the hand of the sun-god the famous code that dates back to 2240 B. C. and which contains among the 280 edicts a rather modernistic catalog of crimes. For acts of perjury, kidnapping, highway robbery, rape, receiving stolen goods, incest, adultery, etc., the death penalty was imposed. Ancient Egyptians likewise throw light upon their current conceptions of the moral and ethical life by means of a "Confession" contained in their "Book of the Dead." In the realm of the dead and before a court of arbiters consisting of forty-two gods the deceased mortal, a newcomer in the realm of the gods, was compelled, as was believed, to recite truthfully as much as possible of the confession which included the following: "I did not slay men; I did not steal; I did not diminish the grain measure; I was never an eavesdropper; I did not do an abomination of the gods, etc." According to the Old Testament capital punishment was common also among the Hebrews. There is also a lengthy list of various penalties for offenses of lesser gravity.

Among devotees of tribal and national religions the relationships existing between ethics and religion become more intricate and complex. The group is responsible for the conduct of the individual. Individual sin gives rise to collective guilt. The manner of expurgating and excoriating an evil with which the entire group has become infested and made liable to punishment in the wake of the offense of a single individual, is illustrated by the following: "A Chinese aided by his wife flogged his mother. The imperial order commanded not only that the criminals should be put to death; it further directed that the head of the clan should be put to death, that the immediate neighbors each receive eighty blows and be sent into the exile; that the representatives of the graduates of the first degree (or A. B.) among whom the male offender ranked should be flogged and exiled; that the granduncle, the uncle, and two older brothers should be put to death; that the prefect and the rulers should for a time be deprived of their rank; that on the face of the mother of the female offender four Chinese characters expressive of neglect of duty towards her daughter should be tatooed, and that she be exiled to a distant province; that the father of the female offender, a bachelor of arts, should not be allowed to take any higher degrees, and that he be flogged and exiled; that the son of the offenders should receive another name, and that the lands of the offender for a time remain fallow."[6]

[6] Gray, China, vol. I, p. 237.

The Role of Tests

Prototypes of the tests used at present in great numbers and endless variety, are found in the contributions of Kraepelin of Germany and Seguin of France. The former as forerunner and founder of modern Psychiatry is known to have stressed and emphasized the need of mental profiles, psychographs, and intelligence scales for the purpose of detecting and diagnosing criminality, thus naturally inclining his test-premonitions in the direction of mental and social deficiencies. The latter, known also as the "Apostle to the Idiot," being a native of that country in which psychology has remained uniquely ancillary to medicine, was interested principally in the classification of the defective. The monumental and epoch-making achievement of Binet of France was originally so designed as to furnish tools for dealing with mental deficiency. The scene of the first Binet test work in America was laid in the psychological clinic. When Terman undertook to revise and Americanize the Binet tests he had in mind the institutions for defectives, reform schools, juvenile courts, and public courts.

More recent literature dealing with the causal relations supposed to exist between diminutive intelligence and crime, indicates that "We have here . . . only three widely divergent views. The first is that mental deficiency is the chief cause of crime; or at least very highly correlated with criminality: the second is that mental deficiency is only one of the factors of crime, and the third is that mental capacity is apparenty related differently to different types of crime, and may possibly not be an important factor at all. All these opinions, though so widely divergent, are based upon the interpretation of the application of mental tests to delinquents."[7] Results obtained in several rather extensive surveys also show that the third view is most tenable and that different types of crime are actually linked with the different levels of intelligence. Various shadings of fraud, such as forgery, embezzlement and counterfeiting, are restricted largely to the group of superior intelligence. A long list of emotional crimes icluding rape, sodomy, felonious assault, homicide and others, is, on the other hand, confined rather consistently to the lower levels of intelligence.

Education per se, no Prophylaxis

Socrates, as we recall, maintained that right thinking is essential to proper conduct. Knowingly and purposively preferring evil to good, he believed, is contrary to human nature. Among recent writers one has asked: "Is knowledge necessary for right conduct, or is it a mere accessory, useful indeed, but not indispensable?

[7] Freeman, Mental Tests, p. 429.

What of the old dictum that virtue is knowledge? . . . Does failure in conduct always imply something amiss in our intellectual processes, or do we err with eyes wide open, in clear and undimmed intellectual vision? That many of the worst acts of men are due to ignorance or to mental limitations no one will be inclined to deny. But that all wrong conduct means some limitation or disturbance in our thinking we also hold true. . . . Whenever we go wrong we go wrong in our thinking."[8]

Plato called attention to the lower appetites that militate against the nobler impulses, also that feeling and thinking represent different springs of action. That education per se or a mechanically constructed intellectual framework is neither bulwark nor prophylaxis against criminality is attested by many outstanding authorities in the field of education. To illustrate this only one such statement need be quoted: viz., "Although pedagogs make a vast claim for the moralizing effect of schooling, I can not find a single criminologist who is satisfied with the modern school while most bring the severest indictments against it for the blind and ignorant assumption that the three R's or any merely intellectual training can moralize."[9]

At the beginning of the nineteenth century German investigators introduced the term "Moralischer Blödsinn," which has been translated into the English and is known as "Moral Imbecility." Its advocates are of the opinion that a person may possess intelligence and education and yet be as helpless as an imbecile when confronted by moral problems. In the Courts this term has served as a convenient label for the classification of feebleminded offenders. The old faculty psychology was also benefited. The human mind, as formerly believed, is composed of various independently functioning compartments, faculties or senses. A moral imbecile was simply one whose brain centers are all, with one exception, capable of being developed, and that one abnormal center was believed to be the neural basis of the moral sense.

In "The British Journal of Medical Psychology" vol. VI., 1926, is found a symposium dealing exclusively with "The Definition and Diagnosis of Moral Imbecility." The contributions included were furnished by internationally recognized authorities but all arrived at the same conclusion—there is no moral imbecility and therefore the term should be dropped.

The Problem Stated

The criminal presents an actual problem. Lawlessness is gnawing the very vitals of our nation and government. Several esti-

[8] Todd, Theories of Social Progress, p. 481.
[9] Hall, G. Stanley, Adolescence, vol. I, p. 406.

mates place the annual cost of crime in our country at $13,000,000,000, a sum equal to the original total of the war debts. It is furthermore pointed out that the total number of men and women of our country who are making their living wholly or in part by crime is 350,000. Expensive Americans these whose annual maintenance amounts to more than $37,000 per person.

When we undertake to locate the underlying causes of the earliest beginnings of criminality we face the same problem that vexed the Greek dealing with hectic fever—in the earlier stages it is hard to diagnose and easy to cure while in the later stages it is easy to diagnose but hard to cure. Forerunners of crime are likewise, as a rule, subtle and recondite. A study of the genesis of crime in the light of ethical and religious factors, is difficult and problematic because of the lack of dependable means and methods of measurement. We therefore turn to materials whose investigation promises more tangible results and among these we find the factor of habit. Of 1916 convicts examined 1497 ascribed their own criminality to habit, especially bad social and leisure habits. No one is unaware of perils lurking in habits involving gang-running, sex-irregularities, gambling, drink, drugs, etc. The power with which habit determines conduct is pointed out by John Dewey who says: "Habits, once formed perpetuate themselves, by acting unremittingly upon the native stock of activities. They stimulate, inhibit, intensify, weaken, select, concentrate and organize the latter into their own likeness. They create out of the formless void of impulses, a world made in their own image. Man is a creature of habit, not of reason nor yet of instinct."[10] Accordingly this investigation undertook the following:

(a) To retrace the life-history of the individual for the purpose of ascertaining the sociological status of the home, the environmental setting, the influence of parents and siblings as conjointly contributing to the aquisition of social or anti-social habits.

(b) To determine what habits were subsequently acquired and operative in bringing about the individual's break with society, special emphasis being placed upon the status of the home, whether intact or broken.

(c) To discover early mental habits regarding Parochial School or Sunday School attendance, participation in family worship, in terms of interest, apathy or antagonism in all matters of a religious nature.

(d) To find what habits manifest themselves in terms of attitudes and reactions at present in connection with the Church as an

[10] Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, p. 125.

institution, the members and people of the Church, also Church work and religious services.

(e) To ascertain the factors, other than the Church and religion, that convicts are in the habit of associating with a safeguard against "getting into trouble."

The Examinees

The group included in this investigations consisted of one hundred male convicts in the Western Penitentiary at Pittsburgh. Sixty-four of these were of the white and thirty-six of the colored group. Thirty of the whites were Protestants and the remaining thirty-four of the Catholic faith. The ages ranged from seventeen to sixty-three years, with a median of 27.8 years. The intelligence quotients (I. Q.) were scattered between the limits of 48 and 113. The I. Q. and mental age medians were as follows:

Groups	I. Q. Median	Mental Age
Prot. Whites	86.00	13 years 9 months
Cath. Whites	82.66	13 " 2 "
Colored	65.66	10 " 6 "
Entire group	80.66	12 " 11 "

Tools and Technique

Because there were no tests available for this type of investigation it was necessary to construct one. When completed it consisted of four parts, the first of which was a questionnaire introduced for the purpose of securing as much information as possible regarding the religious background of the examinee. It therefore deals with the life history, placing emphasis upon experiences of childhood and the earlier years of life, particularly those embracing religion as found in the home. The second part consisted of a Biblical Knowledge Test, likewise devised for this investigation. It is a multiple choice test covering certain events, places and persons mentioned in the Bible. As third and fourth parts, Fernald's Ethical Perception Test and Fernald's Ethical Discrimination Test were used. The results are given in the following table.

Medians of the Scores Made by the Various Groups in the Different Tests

Groups	Biblical Knowledge	Ethical Perception	Ethical Discrimination
Prot. Whites	41.80	46.42	66.75
Cath. Whites	43.85	46.75	66.00
Colored	38.25	32.00	64.80
Entire Group	41.63	42.39	65.87

Conclusions

I. Large families are in the majority among those represented in the prison population, the average being 33 per cent larger than the average size of the family in the American nation as a whole. Where parents are thus preoccupied in the economic struggle connected with providing for a large family and where a proportionately smaller measure of attention and interest can be allotted to the individual child, conflicts easily arise, which in turn are conducive to habits of criminality.

II. The results of this investigation make it clear that the broken home, as a single cause, gives rise to more habits of crime than any other. By adding the possible number of biologically unhealthy, or psychologically broken homes to the 76 per cent, shattered by death, divorce, desertion, or separation, we have a total sufficiently large to speak in no uncertain tones of this one cause of abandoning religious influences and lapsing into criminality.

III. Statistics, as compiled in this undertaking sound a warning against the frequent compulsory participation in church attendance, religious activities, also in Parochial and Sunday School work. Reactions involving bitterness and negativisms, easily lead to mental habits which in turn will engender disregard and contempt for all authority and discipline, law and order.

IV. Mental habits of people, existing on an unusually low ethical plane, prompt them to think of the Church as consisting of a group of people who are almost under obligation to assist the offender in the matter of escaping the consequence of crime and evading a jail or prison sentence. Irrespective of the guilt or the justifiability of punishment, church people should, to use the stock phrase, "help a man when he is in trouble," or at least not "kick a man when he is down."

V. In the mind of the convict the Church is nevertheless an indispensable institution. With very few exceptions the men in prison declare unhesitatingly, however in their own vocabulary, that religion and criminality are wholly incompatible, mutually exclusive, and diametrically opposed to one another. They finally believe that he who abides by the Church, applying her teachings, walking in her ways, will never need to "do time."

VI. As a safeguard against crime, honest work is equally as important as religion and the Church. Ninety-three per cent of the examinees themselves gave this answer to a question calling for "the most important thing a man must do to avoid getting into trouble." Even the men who are serving a prison sentence readily admit that a wholesome respect for higher authority and a reverence for honest work are priceless treasures and a reliable safeguard against crime.

ETHICAL THEORY OF SCHLEIERMACHER

ELMER ARNDT

(Conclusion)

V.

Schleiermacher's treatment of Christian ethics does not reveal any new philosophical principles. From his point of view of the matter, there is posited in the philosophical ethics the reality and substance of all that is most distinctive of the other. The difference between philosophical ethics and Christian ethics is a matter of form not of content. As the elements of the one cannot be contradicted by the elements of the other, so the form of the one is in no element like the form of the other. Thus both are from one point of view completely alike and from another point of view completely unlike.[15] Yet one should not expect to derive Christian ethics from philosophical ethics or to force philosophy to defend Christian ethics. It is true that every moral philosophy must come somewhere on the religious element and establish the relation of men to it. But it cannot be expected that philosophy should deal with the Christian religion because Christianity cannot be demonstrated. What philosophy can do and must do, says Schleiermacher, is to show that the activity of man is conformable to his religious consciousness. In doing this religion is treated as universal, i. e., philosophy deals with those elements which are common to all religions.

On the other hand, it is dangerous for Christian ethics to simply adopt the forms and principles of philosophy. When such has been done two disastrous results have followed: Christian ethics has become embrangled in the clash of philosophical systems, and it becomes exceedingly difficult to present clearly the character of Christian ethics; indeed, what is offered under such circumstances is for the most part a philosophical ethics clothed in Christian terminology. The Christian ethical scientist easily falls into the strife of systems because he is not content with the minimum requirements of his science, namely, to present the elements of Christian ethics in complete connection with each other, but rather seeks the maximum requirement, the presentation of Christian ethics as a complete organism in which the content and the connection of members is identical. Now the closer one approaches the maximum, the more Christian ethics approaches the philosophical. This raises the question, Is a scientific Christian ethics possible? If an affirmative answer is to be given, we must take a different point of view than that which differentiates Christian from philosophical ethics. We have to ask ourselves, "What is the essential and unique quality of Chris-

[15] *Ibid.*, III, p. 124.

tianity which can become a constitutive principle of ethics?"[16] The answer to this question will indicate both the identity and the difference of Christian ethics from Christian theology.

The specifically Christian is that all communion with God is regarded as conditioned through the act of the redeemer through Christ. This is the fact from which both ethics and theology must begin. Ethics, then, is "the representation of the communion with God conditioned through communion with Christ, the Redeemer, so far as this is the motive of all activity of the Christian; it can be nothing else than a description of that manner of activity which originates from the lordship of the Christian religious self-consciousness."[17] Christian ethics is therefore the description of the behavior of the Christian community, the Church, for the Church is the place where the Christian consciousness is the ruling impulse. The Christian ethic describes the behavior of the Christian community insofar as that activity rests on the Redeemer; and such description is a command for all who are in the Church. For there can be no other command for those in the Church than that which is developed out of the absolute communion with God as it was in Christ, the Redeemer.

Here arises a difficulty with which Schleiermacher deals at some length. The Christian life is certainly a life of blessedness. How, then, can impetus to action have any place in it? For impetus to action presupposes that there is some defect to be remedied, while blessedness is complete in itself. The solution of the difficulty lies in the fact that the blessedness of the Christian is a becoming *(Werden)*, a progress, not a being (*Sein*), not an attainment. Still there is the further objection that the blessedness of Christ cannot be thought of as restricted. And yet Christ did engage in activity. Does this mean that his blessedness is restricted? No, for the defect in his blessedness did not arise from himself but in his widening self-consciousness which led him to feel the lack of blessedness in others which constitutes the motive of his whole redeeming work. So it is possible to maintain that blessedness and impetus to activity only stand together insofar as blessedness is only a progress, a becoming. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to discriminate between absolute and relative blessedness. Relative blessedness manifests itself in the change from pleasure to pain in relation to that which is the standard of blessedness. In absolute blessedness there is no such change. The change from pleasure to pain in relative blessedness arises out of the demand for communion with God thought together with its realization without the realiza-

[16] *Ibid.*, III, p. 128.
[17] *Ibid.*, III, p. 129.

tion being determined in any given moment. In the comparison of imperfect blessedness in the moment in which it appears as pleasure with the moment in which it appears as pain, we have the consciousness of a higher life-potency which the Scriptures call 'joy in God.' This consciousness transmutes itself into an impetus to activity for there is always an opposition in the life of the Christian, the warfare of the flesh and the spirit. With the pain of an incomplete blessedness arises the impetus to an activity through which the idea of a relation between the higher and the lower life-potency ought to be restored. With the pleasure of blessedness, the impetus to a wider activity is identical. So the Christian activity takes two forms: a restorative activity and an expansive activity.

But there is still a third kind of activity involved in the Christian life. We have seen that no activity can come from a consciousness of blessedness. And the state in which the lower life-potency is perfectly subordinated to the higher life-potency we have a state analogous to that of blessedness. Now of course, no man ever realizes either blessedness or this state of equilibrium perfectly. But between the moments of pleasure and pain there must necessarily enter some moments of satisfaction, which are, be it observed, only relative. Even this state impels to some action. But what action? Obviously, in that kind of action which is essentially and directly related to no division of life nor determined by it. It does not seek to work any change of any kind in life. It is like art or play sufficient for itself. This is what Schleiermacher calls the manifestive activity of the Christian.

These three kinds of activity include the whole realm of Christian life. Some further explanation of the meaning of the restorative, expansive, and contemplative or manifestive activities of the Christian will make clear how much is included. The rationale of the restorative activity is found in the fact that the Holy Spirit is never completely dominant in the Church. Some residium of sin always remains. The restorative activity is two fold: it is universal, as the action of the Church to eliminate sin from herself; it is individual, as the action of the individual Christian to reform himself. Of course, both the Church as a Community and individuals in the Church interact. Individual Christians exist by means of the Church and are reformed by it. For the Church seeks to bring individuals up to the standard of the Christian life. On the other hand the individual influences the community and by his own high standards helps to raise the level of life in the Church and exerts a quiet influence on others.

The expansive activity of the Christian has as its universal type the redemptive work of Christ. The spring of expansive activity is the feeling of pleasure consequent on the removal of antag-

onism between flesh and spirit. The end of this activity is the perfecting of the whole human race in Christ. Thus the expansive activity has as its object the whole human race. But it has another side also which might be called the intensive activity of the Church, namely, the perfecting of itself in Christ.

The principle of the manifestive activity is, religiously regarded, brotherly love, intellectually regarded, universal love. Brotherly love is the basis of the Church. It is the foundation on which rests the equality of all Christians in relation to Christ and the Spirit. Manifestive activity is expressed in worship, for worship is the manifestive activity in the sphere of active life. Worship is thus its own end, an expression which has no ulterior motive, just as a beautiful painting is an expression of beauty without any object other than its own being.

Thus there are two kinds of impetus: the impetus to an actual activity, and an impulse to representative activity through which man does not proceed from one condition to another but only wishes to fix outwardly the inner determination of his self-consciousness. Worship is the common expression of the second impetus, education of the first. Education includes all elements of self-discipline which are the means for restoring the broken relationship of the lower potencies to the higher ones. And it must be recalled, here as elsewhere, that the two kinds of impetus are always in some measure present together, for the three types of activity are not clear-cut, but rather represent predominant elements. "In every Moment, in which the self-consciousness is predominantly characterized by the indifference of pleasure and pain, there is not only the possibility of the transition to the other two forms, but also that of the continuation of the given determination. And it is also so in each of the other two forms."[18] No rule can be made for determining whether one should remain in any given form or make a transition to another form. The Christian will be guided by the Spirit of God as the principle of his activity. Furthermore, each person is an individual and so his self-consciousness is determined in a unique way. All men are members of the race but each one is distinct from the others. To attempt to impose a rule would be to neglect the individuality of each person. But, one asks, is not the divine Spirit the same in all? Indeed, but it operates differently in different persons and always finds in each man already an individualized reason. "There is no general human activity," Schleiermacher remarks, "absolutely separated from the individual and the individual cannot be caught in a universal formula. But both the universal and the individual have limits. So far as an activity

[18] *Ibid.*, III, p. 152.

has its ground in the individuality of a man, so far it can be judged by no other than himself. But if he judges himself, he is not his own teacher." [19] From the Christian point of view there is no escape from the antithesis of the individual and the universal. But the antithesis is not universal.

In conclusion, it must be pointed out that the conception of the Church with which Schleiermacher operates is not a magical or a supernatural conception. The Church is a developing organism striving to reach the perfection of Christ. As he himself puts it, "It is essential to the uniqueness of the protestant outlook that we think of the Church as a moving whole, one capable of advance and development; only with this restriction, without which Christendom would collapse, that we may never think that there could be aspiration to or exhibition of a perfection in the Christian Church which exceeds that given in Christ, but that each advance can be nothing else than a more correct understanding and a more perfect appropriation of that given in Christ."[20]

[19] *Ibid.*, III, p. 161, footnote.
[20] *Ibid.*, III, p. 169.

Die homiletische Lage in Deutschland

Prof. D. Dr. Herm. Werdermann, Dortmund.

Als nach der Revolution von 1918 eine gewaltige Erschütterung auch über die evangelische Kirche kam und ihren äußeren und inneren Bestand bedrohte, begannen die Besten darüber nachzusinnen, wie unsrer evangelischen Kirche geholfen werden könnte. Manche fragten, ob man die Tore nicht weiter aufmachen sollte, ob man nicht noch weitherziger auf das Gegenwartsgeschehen eingehen und sich der Zeit mehr anpassen sollte. Andre schauten nach der katholischen Kirche, suchten engere Beziehung zu ihr und überlegten, ob wir nicht manches von dieser Kirche übernehmen könnten. Sie hatte ihren Kultus mit aller Feierlichkeit und Sinnfälligkeit und Schönheit und Mystik. Luther hatte sich im Reformationszeitalter scharf dagegen gewendet. Aber ob man nicht jetzt den eigenen Kultus in dieser Richtung bereichern könnte? Wieder andre versuchten es mit ganz neuen Formen, wie etwa die Anthroposophie und Christengemeinschaft. In der „Menschenweihhandlung" wurde ein neuer Weg gesucht, unsre Zeitgenossen und gerade die Gebildeten unter ihnen anzuziehen und zu befriedigen.[1]

Mit Recht empfanden die meisten Theologen jedoch, sowohl an der Universität als im praktischen Pfarramt, daß für unsre evangelische Kirche, wenn sie ihren Namen noch weiter verdiente, auf das zurückgegriffen werden müßte, was für Luther selbst im Mittelpunkt gestanden hatte: die **Wortverkündigung,** die Evangeliumsverkündigung, die Predigt. Ueber der Tür zur Wittenberger Stadtkirche, wo Luther einst seine gewaltigen Predigten gehalten hat,[2] steht die Losung: **„Verbo solo."** So besann man sich aufs neue auf das reformatorische Prinzip; und wie es materialiter heißt: „Sola fide," so formal: Allein durchs Wort! Deshalb setzte eine zentrale Selbstbesinnung auf die Art wahrer evangelischer Predigt ein. Wenn jede Predigt eine Synthese ist zwischen Wort Gottes, Gemeinde und Prediger, so wurde dem ersten Punkt die besondre Beachtung geschenkt.

Das **„Theozentrische"** wurde stark betont. Karl Holl in Berlin, der Bahnbrecher der neuen Lutherforschung, erklärte: Die Predigt hat keinen andern Zweck, als Gott zu vergegenwärtigen. Man

---

[1] Von diesen und ähnlichen Versuchen soll in einem späteren Aufsatz über die Liturgische Lage berichtet werden.

[2] Vgl. die neuen Ausgaben: Georg Buchwald, Predigten D. Martin Luthers auf Grund von Nachschriften Georg Rörers und Anton Lauterbachs. Bertelsmann 1925. 2 Bände. Ferner: Fr. Hogarten, Martin Luther. Predigten. Mit einem Nachwort. Jena 1927. Em. Hirsch, Luthers Werke in Auswahl. Ein Band. Berlin 1932.

muß den Menschen, der redet, ganz vergessen können. Professor Fezer, praktischer Theologe in Tübingen, forderte in einer besonderen Schrift über „Predigt und Wort Gottes“ (Kalw 1925): Die Predigt soll Gott bringen und nicht allgemeine Wahrheiten über ihn. Auch Karl Barth stellte als Ziel der Predigt hin, daß „Gott selber rede.“ Barth war damals nach der Revolution ja noch Pfarrer in der Schweiz und hielt seine ersten Vorträge und machte seine ersten Veröffentlichungen gerade aus selbstempfundener Predigtnot heraus. Er faßte das Problem ganz in der Tiefe an, indem er von der formalen Frage: Wie sollen wir predigen? zu der zentralen Frage durchstieß: Können und dürfen wir überhaupt predigen? Dürfen wir Menschlein es wagen, in Gottes Namen auf die Kanzel zu steigen und uns als Verkündiger des Gotteswortes bezeichnen?

Mit großem Ernst wurde von vielen Seiten betont, wie sich zunächst auch der Prediger unter das Gericht, unter den Bußruf Gottes stellen muß; wie es nicht ankommt auf seine Tüchtigkeit und Begabung, auch nicht auf seine durchschnittliche oder bessere oder beste Vorbildung und Geschicklichkeit, auch nicht einmal auf den äußeren Beifall und „Erfolg.“ Alles, was der Prediger, der Durchschnittsprediger, aber auch der beste Prediger, tut, ist und bleibt „fragwürdig.“ Denn der Ort, da der Prediger steht, ist heiliges Land. Gott selbst ist an diesem Ort. Wer die Kanzeltreppe besteigt, darf es nur mit einem inneren Erzittern tun. Gott ist nicht „Gegenstand“ unsrer Predigt. Wo Gott ist, ist er stets Subjekt, bleibt er der Schöpfer und der Heilige, vor dem wir in Kreatur- und Sündengefühl erschauern müssen, gerade dann, wenn wir Theologen sind und Gott durch uns Zeugnis geben will.

Es ist uns zum Bewußtsein gekommen, wie viel „unfromme“ Predigten Sonntag für Sonntag gehalten werden, auch von uns gehalten werden. Man sucht schön zu predigen, eindringlich zu predigen, erfolgreich zu predigen und merkt nicht, wie man Gottes Ehre damit hinter das eigene kleine Ich zurückstellt. Nicht der Aesthet predigt, nicht der Dichter, nicht der literarisch und zeitgeschichtlich Interessierte, nicht der Orthodoxe, der etwas „hat,“ nicht die liberale „suchende Seele,“ sondern: Der, der einen Auftrag von Gott hat, mit Gottes Wort als wirklicher Verkündigung, trete auf die Kanzel! Als Menschen müssen wir zurücktreten und immer wieder fragen: Wie schaden wir nicht? Wir müssen Gott ganz ernst nehmen. Barth wagt sogar die beißende Ironie zu sagen: Wir müssen ihn wenigstens ebenso ernst nehmen wie uns selbst! Es muß dem Prediger bewußt sein, daß Gott vor ihm war und nach ihm sein wird; daß er ohne uns sein kann; daß er uns zerbrechen und verwerfen kann. Wir sind es nicht, die da wirken, sondern Gott. Wir reden nicht, sondern es ist Gottes Wort, das erklingt

und wirkt. Es muß uns stets gegenwärtig sein, daß die Sache seine Sache, daß die Ehre seine Ehre, daß der Erfolg sein Erfolg ist, wobei Luther es wagt fortzufahren: daß der Mißerfolg sein Mißerfolg ist! Wir nehmen nicht aus dem Eigenen, sondern „aus seiner Fülle haben wir alle genommen Gnade um Gnade."

Dabei ist es das Große an Luther, daß er ganzen Ernst gerade mit der Güte, Barmherzigkeit und Gnade Gottes macht; daß er weniger vom „Wort Gotes" als vom „**Evangelium**" redet, von der frohen Botschaft, die ein Volk, eine Menschheit, ein Einzelmensch gerade dann braucht und hört, wenn alles in Trümmer zu gehen droht. Luther bleibt nicht bei der Sünde stehen, sondern spricht von der Vergebung der Sünden, auch für den Prediger selbst. Luther, der auch von den Abgründen des verborgenen Gottes weiß, preist gerade auch als Prediger und für den Prediger die Gnade des in Christus offenbaren Gottes.[3]

Mit Gott und Gottes Wort in der Bibel und in der Predigt ist etwas gegeben, was größer ist als der Prediger, der es verkündigt, als die Gemeinde, die es hört. Darum hat die homiletische Besinnung in Deutschland in den letzten zehn Jahren vor allem angeknüpft an die Wahrheit des Lutherwortes: „Es ist alles andre besser nachgelassen denn das Wort." Entweder bringt die Predigt wirklich Gottes Botschaft an die Gemeinde, so daß diese sie hören kann, oder sie ist keine Predigt. Ja, hier liegt allein das, was der Predigt in der Gegenwart noch ihre Berechtigung gibt. Eindringlich und anschaulich hat dies Wilfried Lempp, einer der Mitarbeiter Theodor Zöcklers in dem großen Liebeswerk in Galizien, in einer Schrift „Zur Rettung des evangelischen Predigtgottesdienstes" (München 1926) ausgeführt. Er geht davon aus, daß die Predigt im Laufe der letzten fünfzig Jahre starke Konkurrenz bekommen: durch die Zeitungen, durch Zeitschriften, durch Bücher und Broschüren, durch Radio, durch hoch interessante Vorträge und geistreiche Darbietungen. Lempp fragt: „Was soll da ein armer evangelischer Pfarrer noch bieten?" Er antwortet: „Doch; wenn im evangelischen Predigtgottesdienst wirklich der lebendige Gott zu den Menschen redet, wie soll da ein armes Menschlein, und wäre es der bedeutendste Redner der Welt, mit einem Vortrag seiner Gedanken dagegen aufkommen" (S. 26). Die Predigt hat nur Sinn, wenn sie etwas allem andern unbedingt Ueberlegenes, etwas Uebergewaltiges ist, was die Menschen durch und durch ergreift." „Wenn die Predigt ist, was sie sein sollte, dann fehlt die Gegenwart des heiligen Gottes nicht. Ja, wenn diese fehlt, ist es eben keine Predigt gewesen!"

---

[3] Vgl. hierzu: H. Werdermann, Zur Gemeindepredigt der Gegenwart. Anregungen von Luther her. 435. Gütersloh, 1930.

Dabei handelt es sich nicht einfach um „Schriftlesung," sondern um die „viva vox evangelii, die Luther immer wieder nennt und preist. Dieses „**lebendige** Wort" ist zu Luthers Zeit das Mittel gewesen, mit dem die Reformation die Herzen erobert hat; es ist auch heute noch das Mittel, daß Gott uns gelassen, ja wieder neu gegeben hat. Das galt für die Zeit nach der marxistischen Revolution 1918. Das gilt auch für die Zeit nach der nationalen Revolution im Jahre 1933. Ja, wer die Zeichen der Zeit im Sinn Adolf Hitlers recht versteht, der wird sich als Pastor jetzt und in Zukunft in viel höherem Maße auf die evangelische Wortverkündigung konzentrieren. Der Pastor soll nicht Politik treiben, weder der katholische noch der evangelische; das hat mit seinem „Hirtenamt" nichts zu tun. Der Pastor der letzten Jahre hat unter der Ueberbürdung durch äußerliche Pflichten geseufzt; Vereinstätigkeit und Wohlfahrtsarbeit hatten alles andre überwuchert. Diese Arbeit ist jetzt weitgehend vom Staat übernommen worden. Der Pastor soll vor allem seine eigentlichste Aufgabe erfüllen: Seelsorge treiben, das Evangelium verkündigen. Und darin werden ihm auf der Kanzel nicht nur keine Hindernisse in den Weg gelegt, sondern das wird gewünscht, damit vom Christentum her die innersten Kraftquellen erschlossen werden, die die Seele froh und ein Volk stark machen.

Wenn gelegentlich die Frage aufgeworfen ist: Ist nicht die Zeit der Predigt vorüber? so kann darauf geantwortet werden: Die Zeit der saft- und kraftlosen Predigt, des erstarrten Bibelbuchstabens, des Sichverlierens in Relativität und Gegenwartsprobleme, das Sichaustoben unerzogener Individualität auf der Kanzel, das und noch vieles mehr ist vorüber. Aber die Zeit der rechten Predigt ist jetzt ebenso wie früher. Und da gilt Römer 10: „Wie sollen sie glauben an den, von dem sie nichts gehört haben? Wie sollen sie aber hören ohne Prediger? So kommt der Glaube aus der Predigt, das Predigen aber durch das Wort Gottes." (Vers 14 und 17.) Auch heute noch werden viel Hunderttausende durch das Wort von der Kanzel erreicht. Und im letzten Jahr ist in vielen Gegenden in Deutschland der Kirchenbesuch wesentlich gestiegen. Und bei unzähligen andern ist ein bewußtes oder unbewußtes Sehnen vorhanden, daß die evangelische Kirche das lösende Wort fände und eine Sprache der Verkündigung, die der deutsch-evangelische Mensch des 20. Jahrhunderts verstünde, die ihn packte.

Damit diese wirklich geschieht, kommt es nun auf den zweiten homiletischen Faktor an: die rechte Berücksichtigung der **Gemeinde,** für die gepredigt wird. Jesus hat uns in dem Gleichnis von dem viererlei Acker achten gelehrt auch auf die Beschaffenheit und Verschiedenheit des Ackers, des Herzensackers. Und nachdem wir bis-

her versucht haben, mit allem Ernst den Ton darauf zu legen, daß die rechte evangelische Predigt ewigkeitsgemäß sein müsse, muß nun mit demselben Ernst hinzugefügt werden: Sie muß auch **zeitgemäß** sein. Beides schließt sich keineswegs aus. „Göttlich" heißt niemals: zeitlos, sondern: ewig, in dem Sinn fortwährender göttlicher Gegenwart für jede einzelne Lage, in der Menschen und Gemeinden und Völker sich befinden.

Darin ist uns die Bibel selbst die beste Anleitung. Gott hat in seinen Offenbarungen nie abstrakt geredet. Er hat Menschen, zeitlich bedingte und gebundene Menschen, unvollkommene und sündige, mit bestimmten Anlagen und Temperamenten ausgestattete Menschen in seinen Dienst gerufen und verwendet. Und sie haben Gottes Auftrag erfüllt unter ganz konkreten Zeitbedingungen an ganz bestimmten Gemeinden. Dadurch hat das Matthäusevangelium eine ganz andre Eigenart als das Markusevangelium. Darum schreibt Paulus an die Korinther anders als an die Galater, an die Philipper anders als an die Römer. Predigt und Gemeinde stehen nicht in Gegensatz zueinander, sondern in notwendiger Wechselbeziehung.

Das beweist auch ein Blick auf **Luthers** Predigttätigkeit. Diese ist predigtgeschichtlich oft ganz falsch beurteilt worden. Das kam daher, daß von ihm vor allem zwei Werke bekannt und verbreitet waren, nämlich die Predigt- und die Hauspostille. Nun sind beides wertvolle Lutherschriften. Nur kann man den Prediger und erst recht nicht den Gemeindeprediger Luther daraus kennen lernen. Denn das ist gewiß, daß keine der dort aufbewahrten „Predigten" so von Luther gehalten ist, wie sie da auf uns gekommen sind. Oft sind mehrere Predigten zu einer einzigen vereinigt, fremde Stücke, z. B. aus Melanchthonischen Predigten, sind hineingeraten. In den Predigtpostillen Luthers handelt es sich nicht um wirkliche Predigten, erst recht nicht um „Musterpredigten," sondern um „Materialsammlungen," aus denen die damals unselbständigen Prediger der ersten reformatorischen Generation schöpfen sollten. So sind die dort gebotenen Predigten, die auch fast alle unverhältnismäßig lang sind, ganz losgelöst von Raum und Zeit, während die Bindung daran für den wirklichen Prediger Luther stets stark vorhanden gewesen ist.

Wir können uns auf Luther selbst berufen, wenn in der homiletischen Aussprache in Deutschland in mannigfacher Form gefordert wurde, daß die Predigt: **gemeindegemäß** sein sollte. Als Luther 1518 eine Anzahl Katechismuspredigten in lateinischer Sprache über die zehn Gebote herausgab, veröffentlichte er sie unter dem Titel: „Decem praecepta, unter der Hinzufügung: „Witten-

[4] Weimarer Ausgabe, Band I, S. 394 ff.

bergensi praedicata populo.[4] Das Evangelium ist für alle Menschen, die Predigt dagegen für eine bestimmte Gemeinde. Und dem oben erwähnten Lutherforscher G. Buchwald ist es gelungen, die Wittenberger Gemeindepredigten für die Jahre 1528—1532 in ziemlich genauer Form wiederherzustellen. Luther selbst hat seine Predigten nämlich niemals wörtlich aufgeschrieben, so daß wir unter all den vielen Lutherpredigten der Erlanger und Weimarer Ausgabe keine einzige genau so haben, wie sie Luther gehalten hat. Für die oben erwähnten Jahre lagen nun mehrere Nachschriften von Studenten vor, zu denen Buchwald in der Jenaer Universitätsbibliothek noch eine neue entdeckte, so daß er nun durch Vergleich den wahrscheinlich ursprünglichen Wortlaut wiederherstellen konnte. Da ist man überrascht, wie anschaulich Luther in das Leben seiner Gemeinde hineingegriffen hat, wie er auch auf der Kanzel, im Licht des Gotteswortes, von all den großen und kleinen Dingen gesprochen hat, die die Väter und Mütter, die Bürger und Studenten, den sächsischen Staat und das deutsche Volk damals bewegten. Es sind so viel Einzelzüge vorhanden, daß es nach vierhundert Jahren sogar möglich ist, ein ganz anschauliches Bild der damaligen Wittenberger Gemeinde zu rekonstruieren.[5] Es war möglich, aus ganzen Predigten oder Einzelbemerkungen Genaueres zu erfahren über die Predigtzuhörer und die Gottesdienste, Beichte und Abendmahl, Opfer und Abgaben. Wir schauen hinein in das Leben im Hause, bei Eltern und Kindern und Gesinde, Hochzeit und Ehe. Aber wir erfahren auch viel über die damalige allgemeine Unzufriedenheit, über den Wucher, über Landwirtschaft und Gewerbe, über Verkehr und Wirtshaus, Bettler und Verbrecher, Obrigkeit und Krieg, Krankheit, Aberglaube, Tod und vieles andre mehr. (Dies alles sind die Ueberschriften der Abschnitte in dem in der Anmerkung genannten Buch.)

Die Forderung der „Gemeindegemäßheit" der Predigt darf auf keinen Fall so aufgefaßt werden, als handelte es sich um Abstriche vom Evangelium, um Verkürzungen und Entstellungen. Durch Zugeständnisse ist im Grund niemand zu gewinnen; eher durch das Gegenteil! Gemeindegemäß predigen heißt nicht: predigen, was die Gemeinde will, was sie wünscht, wonach ihr die Ohren jücken, sondern: ihr sagen, was Gott gerade von ihr will, was sie braucht, wie sie ist und wie sie sein sollte. Die Gemeinde ist nicht Quelle der Predigt, sondern Beziehungspunkt. Die Predigt ist ein Dialog: ein Dialog Gottes mit dem Prediger, aber durch den Prediger auch mit der Gemeinde. Die Rücksicht auf die Gemeinde

---

5 Vgl. H. Werdermann, Luthers Wittenberger Gemeinde, wiederhergestellt aus seinen Predigten. Zugleich ein Beitrag zu Luthers Homiletik. 3215. Gütersloh, 1929.

geht für Luther allein schon aus der Liebe hervor, aus dem Sich-Einstellen auf die „Einfältigen." Luther hat jahrzehntelang so ganz mit der Wittenberger Gemeinde gelebt, daß die innere Beziehung ohne weiteres gegeben war. Der Prediger der Gegenwart, der meist nicht mehr in so enger und so langer Lebensgemeinschaft mit seiner Gemeinde steht, muß sich einstellen auf seine Gemeinde. Er muß ihre Geschichte und Vergangenheit kennen lernen; er muß religiöse Volkskunde treiben. Er muß Seelenkunde studiert haben und an lebendigen Menschen immer weiter studieren. Er muß Seelsorge treiben, Hausbesuche machen und innere Fühlung mit der ihm anvertrauten Gemeinde gewinnen.

In den letzten Jahrzehnten hatte in Deutschland weithin zu sehr eine blasse „Normalpredigt" geherrscht. Vielleicht hängt das mit der Bewertung der **akademischen Predigten** zusammen. An allen Universitäten wurden und werden solche gehalten, bald von dem praktischen Theologen, bald von besonderen beauftragten Universitätspredigern, bald von allen Professoren der Fakultät. Das ist erfreulich, und diese Gottesdienste erfreuen sich meist eines guten Zuspruchs, vor allem von den jungen Theologiestudenten, aber auch sonst von den akademisch Gebildeten des Ortes. Eine große Anzahl dieser Predigten sind später auch gedruckt worden und haben weite Verbreitung gefunden. In der Predigtliteratur der letzten Zeit ist die Zahl der Bände dieser Art auffällig groß. Wir nennen die Namen: Althaus, Eger, Heim, Hirsch, Loofs, Stange, Schlatter. Ihre Predigten bedeuten etwas sehr Großes für den Pastor und zwar für ihn als akademisch gebildeten Christen. Aber unbewußt haben diese Predigten auf die jungen Theologen sehr oft als homiletische Vorbilder gewirkt. Und die Art, die für die Gemeinde des akademischen Gottesdienstes die richtige war, ist für die Kleinstadt und gar für das Dorf ganz unangebracht. Es gilt hier für die Professoren und ihre Predigten, was Nietschel einmal über den früheren Oberhofprediger Kögel gesagt hat, der auch in seiner Zeit in ungeschickter Weise nachgeahmt wurde: „Die Vortrefflichkeit der Leistung schließt keineswegs die Vorbildlichkeit des Modells für andre mit ein!" So war in Deutschland eine Predigtart entstanden, die man als sonderbar blaß, allgemein, popularisiert — akademisch, blutleer, rein gedankenmäßig und logisch, lebensform und lebensfremd charakterisieren kann.

Eine erfreuliche Lebensnähe ging auf die deutschen Prediger in der ganzen letzten Generation von den **deutsch-schweizerischen** Predigern aus, deren Veröffentlichungen in großer Zahl gekauft und gelesen wurden. Der erste in dieser Reihe ist A. Bitzius, der Sohn des alten Jeremias Gotthelf. „Ausgewählte Predigten" sind 1925 im Verlag von Perthes, Gotha, erschienen (360 Seiten, 7 Mark). Dann sind zu nennen die religiös-sozialen Prediger Ragaz und

Kutter, ferner Aeschbacher und Amsler. Vor allem hat aber auf Deutschland der Baseler Prediger Gustav **Benz** gewirkt und wirklich vorbildlich gewirkt. Seine Predigtsammlungen: In der Gewalt Jesu; Vom Leben erfaßt; Unser Vater, unsre Brüder; Dennoch bei Gott; Jesus der Weg; Vom Anfang aller Dinge; Ich bin der Herr, dein Gott! sind in immer neuen Auflagen erschienen. Hier ist die biblische Tiefe mit Lebensnähe und Gemeindegemäßheit verbunden. Benz hat in manchen Landesteilen so stark gewirkt, daß wohl ein Kirchenführer seine Pfarrer humorvoll warnen konnte, sie sollten homiletisch nicht zu sehr mit „Benz-ol" fahren, sondern lieber „Auto-e" benutzen, um ihr Selbst nicht hinter dem Schweizer Prediger verschwinden lassen!

Jedenfalls haben uns die deutsch-schweizerischen Prediger einen starken Anstoß gegeben, Gottes Wort wirksam für unsre Zeit und unsre Gemeinden werden zu lassen. Der Schweizer Professor Brunner pflegte in seinen Predigt-Kritiken gelegentlich zu sagen, wenn sie wieder solche Normal-Predigt gehalten hatten: „Es stimmt schon; aber es rüttelt nicht." Und die rechte Predigt muß doch aufrüttelnden Charakter haben. Es muß etwas hindurchzittern von dem, was die alten Propheten gefaßt hat, wenn sie, ein Amos wie ein Jesaia, ein Hosea wie ein Jeremia vor ihre Zeit hintraten! So muß der rechte evangelische Gemeindeprediger etwas Packendes, Aufrüttelndes haben. Natürlich soll hier nicht etwa irgend welcher Grobschlächtigkeit oder gar Taktlosigkeit das Wort geredet werden. Die einzelnen Predigtbücher sollen sich angegriffen fühlen, allerdings nicht von einem taktlosen Pastor, sondern von dem allerhöchsten Gott. Das wird die Kirchgänger zunächst überraschen, vielleicht auch verletzen, wenn sie gern „schöne" Predigten rühmen und das „gute Organ" oder die rührseligen „Zeugnisse" ihres Predigers hören wollen! Das wird aber denen etwas geben, die als gotthungrige, unter Gott Leidende in die Kirche kommen. Und es werden ihrer wieder mehr werden, wenn sie merken: In den evangelischen Predigten werden Gotteswirklichkeiten und Lebenswirklichkeiten geboten. Die, denen es ernst ist mit ihrem Christentum, wollen, daß ihnen etwas zugemutet wird; daß man sich persönlich an sie wendet, daß sie angepackt, ja angegriffen werden.

Die „Deutschen Christen" haben jetzt vor allem laut die Forderung nach **volkstümlicher** Verkündigung erhoben. Schon im Jahre 1927 waren zwei Schriften erschienen, die in dieselbe Richtung gewiesen hatten. H. v. Lüpke, der langjährige Herausgeber der „Dorfkirche," schrieb über „Volkstümlichkeit" (Langensalza). Dieser Begriff muß allerdings richtig gefaßt werden. Volkstümlichkeit bedeutet keineswegs, „was jeder versteht und was jedem gefällt." Dann könnte und dürfte eine christliche Predigt nicht „volkstümlich" sein! Es handelt sich auch nicht um „populärisieren"; das ist die

Forderung einer alternden, untergehenden Kultur! „Volkstum" ist vielmehr das innewohnende Wesen des Volkes, wie Jahn es formuliert; es ist das ursprünglich im Volk und aus ihm Wachsende. Daran soll die Homiletik anknüpfen, wie als zweiter G. Hilbert nach „Volkstümlichen Predigten" gerufen hat (Leipzig 1927). Er wirft den meisten Predigern vor, daß sie unvolkstümlich und darum so wirkungslos sind. Die Pastoren „reden die Sprache der Bildung, nicht die Sprache des Volkes" (S. 5). Im Laufe der Entwicklung sei die Predigt „korrekter, feierlicher, ästhetisch einwandfreier" geworden; aber an Unmittelbarkeit und Volkstümlichkeit habe sie eingebüßt. Sie sei sehr fern von der Art Jesu. Der Grund wird darin gesucht, daß Lorenz von Mosheim (gestorben 1755), der „Vater der modernen Homiletik," sich von den bedeutenden französischen Rhetoren und Kanzelrednern habe beeinflussen lassen. Dadurch sei in die deutsche Predigt etwas Wesensfremdes hineingekommen, und von Luther habe die Entwicklung abgeführt.

Diesen Ruf nach volkstümlicher Wortverkündigung haben die „Deutschen Christen" im letzten Jahr stark aufgenommen. Sie haben mit Recht darauf aufmerksam gemacht, daß hier eine Beziehung der Predigt, ja der Religion überhaupt übersehen, wenigstens vernachlässigt worden sei. Gott habe seine Beziehung zum einzelnen, zu seiner Seele, und das ist etwas Wesentliches, was der Protestantismus nie vergessen darf. Dem ewigen allmächtigen Gott entspricht ferner als Beziehung die ganze Welt, die gesamte Menschheit, wie Jesus seine Jünger hinausgeschickt hat „in alle Welt." Aber außer den beiden Beziehungen: „Gott und die Seele," die leicht nur individualistisch aufgefaßt wird, und „Gott und die Welt," die in die Gefahr eines blassen Internationalismus gerät, gibt es auch noch die Beziehung: „Gott und **das Volk.**" Das lehrt uns gerade das Alte Testament. Darum sagt Jesus auch den Jüngern: Lehret alle Völker! Und wenn Paulus den Juden ein Jude, den Griechen ein Grieche, den Römern ein Römer geworden ist, müssen wir, die deutschen Prediger, den Deutschen ein Deutscher werden, in höherem Maße, als es bisher beachtet worden ist. Ja noch genauer: Wir müssen so reden, daß unsre deutschen Zeitgenossen in ihrer jetzigen besonderen Lage sich angesprochen fühlen und den Weg zu Gott wieder finden. Denn das Bewußtsein ist in Deutschland lebendig: Während wir bisher unter dem niederdrükkenden Eindruck lebten, der in dem Buchtitel Spenglers seinen Ausdruck gefunden hat: „Untergang des Abendlandes," ist durch den nationalen Sozialismus ein neues starkes frohes Lebensgefühl erwacht, daß wir nicht am Ende, sondern am Anfang stehen, daß nicht Untergang, sondern Neuanfang die Parole der Stunde ist. Und wenn alles im Aufbruch begriffen ist, kann die Kirche mit ihrer Ver-

kündigung nicht dahinten bleiben. Sie soll ihre Stimme erheben und Gottes Wort, in Gericht und Gnade, den deutschen Zeitgenossen künden.

Auch hier ist Luther wieder das Vorbild. Er ist tatsächlich der religiöse Reformator, aber er hat sich zugleich den „Propheten der Deutschen" genannt. Darum hat er deutsch und deutlich geredet. Er ist wirklich ein „Volks"-Redner gewesen. Seine Mahnung, „den Leuten aufs Maul zu sehen," die er in dem Sendschreiben vom Dolmetschen ausspricht, gilt nicht nur für den Bibelübersetzer, sondern auch für den Prediger. Ein volkstümlicher Prediger soll nicht sagen, was die Leute hören wollen, sondern: das Evangelium und alles, was sie hören sollen, ihnen so sagen, daß sie es erfassen können. Er muß vor allem den Gemütston treffen und zum Herzen reden.

Von hier aus ist auch die Forderung erhoben worden, daß der Prediger **Psychologie** treiben solle. In der Pädagogik hat sich diese Forderung heute überall durchgesetzt. In der Homiletik wird sie noch mit einem gewissen Mißtrauen betrachtet, wieder unter der Befürchtung, als sollte dadurch dem göttlichen und ewigen Charakter der Predigt etwas genommen werden. Dem gegenüber prägt G. Flemming den Satz: „Wir glauben gewiß an die wunderwirkende Kraft des göttlichen Wortes. Aber sie tritt nicht mechanisch auf. Der psychologische Boden muß bei den Hörern vorbereitet werden." Wir lehnen auch das falsche „Psychologisieren" ab, als wenn die Seelenkunde für den Pastor und Prediger ein Zauberschlüssel wäre, als wenn diese Kunst ihn befähigte, „ganz, wie er will, auf der Seelen-Klaviatur seiner Zuhörer zu spielen." Bei aller Wortverkündigung bleibt das Geheimnis des heiligen Geistes, der da weht und wirkt, wo er will. Darum kann es vorkommen, daß wirkungsvoll geplante, psychologisch gut aufgebaute Predigten völlig wirkungslos bleiben, daß manche Zuhörer sich überhaupt nicht ansprechen lassen; daß umgekehrt ein Wort Wirkungen hervorrufen, bekehren, erneuern kann, wo wir es nicht geahnt, nicht gewollt und gedacht haben. Ist die Seelenkunde also kein Zaubermittel, so ist sie doch für den Homileten ein wertvolles **Hilfsmittel,** das er nicht verachten sollte, wie er nun auch den Zweck der Predigt ansieht.

Auch über diesen Zweck ist eine lebhafte Aussprache geführt worden. Manche vertraten die Ansicht: die Predigt soll vor allem belehren; sie hat die reine Lehre des göttlichen Wortes zu bringen. Andre treten dafür ein: Die Predigt soll vor allem bekehren, zur Buße treiben und neue Menschen schaffen. In der Volkskirche sahen andre die Aufgabe: Pädagogisch zu wirken, volkserzieherisch sich einzustellen im sittlich-religiösen Sinn. Manche betonten: Aufgabe der Predigt ist es: „Gott zu ehren" und sein Reich und seine Majestät vor allem im Auge zu haben und zu preisen. Eine

Entscheidung in diesen Dingen wird nie herbeigeführt werden können, da alle diese Auffassungen ihre Berechtigung haben und übrigens bei Luther, in der großen Zahl seiner Predigten, sämtlich nebeneinander vorhanden sind. Ebenso gehen die einen Bestrebungen mehr dahin: homilienartig, auf Grund längerer Texte und Perikopen in das Gotteswort einzuführen; die andern wollten mehr, an der Hand von kurzen Texten „thematisch" predigen und Gegenwartsfragen behandeln. Manche verlangten eine „apologetische" Note, andre versuchten es mit erbaulichen Geschichten. Hierüber wird es keine allgemeinen Regeln geben. Dabei wird auch die persönliche Art des Predigers, daneben allerdings auch die Beschaffenheit seiner Gemeinde den Ausschlag geben.

Damit sind wir noch bei einer letzten Forderung: der **Anschaulichkeit** der Predigt. Fr. Niebergall hat sich dafür besonders eingesetzt, sowohl in seiner „Praktischen Theologie" wie in seinen Untersuchungen „Wie predigen wir dem modernen Menschen?" . „Statt langer Gedankengänge: Anschauungen, Einkleidungen, Gestaltungen." „Nicht definieren; immer beschreiben." „Wir müssen die Ohren in Augen verwandeln." Aus den Predigten soll das unpersönliche und langweilige Wörtchen „man" verschwinden. Und wie häufig ist es gerade zu finden! Die Einführung „Man sollte" oder „Man hat gesagt" erweckt nicht die geringste Spannung. Luther sagt dafür: Du, ich; wir, ihr; ihr Wittenberger, wir Deutschen. Er unterscheidet in seiner Gemeinde Gruppen: die Bürger, die Studenten, die Eltern, die Kinder, die Alten, die Jungen, die Selbstsicheren, die Angefochtenen. Und wer „Anschauung" sucht, der wird in der Kirchengeschichte, in Luthers Leben, in der Inneren und Aeußeren Mission reichlich Stoff finden. Wie unerschöpflich sind hier allein solche Bücher wie Bodelschwinghs Leben oder Albert Schweitzers Missionsbücher!

Wir haben eben bereits die **Predigerpersönlichkeit** erwähnt. Und über sie muß als dritter homiletischer Faktor wenigstens ein kurzes Wort gesagt werden. Sie hat ihr Recht und ihre Grenzen. Wir kommen aus Jahrzehnten her, wo die „Persönlichkeit" sehr gepriesen wurde und das „Recht der Individualität" schrankenlos anerkannt wurde. Und homiletisch hieß es dann: „Auswirkung der Predigerpersönlichkeit auf der Kanzel!" Demgegenüber hat Niebergall scharf erklärt: „Die Kanzel ist nicht der Ort, wo jemand seine kostbare Persönlichkeit austoben soll!" Auch Lempp klagt darüber: „Das eigentliche Hindernis für die Wirkung der Predigt, das sind wir, daß wir uns immer in den Vordergrund drängen." Und Barth ruft: „Wo kann ernstlicher vom Zorn Gottes die Rede sein als über uns Pfarrern?" Luther rühmt es auch an Johannes dem Täufer wiederholt, daß „er nicht an Christi Statt treten wollte, als wenn er selbst Christus wäre." Und Georg

Schulz sagt von dem Prediger Luther: „Er ist eine einzigartige Erfahrung, weil die Predigt noch mehr ist als der Prediger, weil der Große hinter dem Größeren verschwindet."

So werden wir zur Vorsicht gemahnt. Aber das ist nur die eine Seite. Die Mahnung und Warnung muß ebenso deutlich nach der entgegengesetzten Seite ausgesprochen werden. Denn wie hat die Predigtwirksamkeit in unzähligen Fällen unter dem Durchschnittsprediger gelitten! Wie verbreitet war auch auf den Kanzeln der „Dutzendredner" mit Langeweile und stereotypen Redewendungen! Darum hatten es viele alte und junge Pastoren so nötig, daß sie ermahnt wurden: Erziehe dich selbst; entwickle die besonderen Gaben, die Gott in dich hineingelegt hat. Gottes Wille ist nun einmal nicht das Neutrum oder gar die Null, sondern die Individualität! Welche individuelle Mannigfaltigkeit bemerken wir unter den Gestalten der Propheten, der Apostel, der Reformatoren! „Der Sieg des heiligen Geistes bedeutet keinen Verlust des menschlichen" (Kögel). Daß dies in Luthers Sinn ist, bezeugt auch seine Erklärung seines Wappens: „Das erste soll ein Kreuz sein, schwarz, im Herzen, das seine natürlichen Farben hätte. Ob's nun schon ein schwarz Kreuz ist, mortifizieret und soll euch wehe tun, dennoch läßt es das Herz in seiner Farbe und verderbt die Natur nicht, das ist: Es tötet nicht, sondern hält lebendig."

Der Evangelische Pastor und die Bibelkritik.

Dr. G. Fr. Schuetze.

Der Evangelische Pastor und die Bibelkritik, welche Fülle von Gedanken löst diese Themastellung nicht in jedem Theologen aus. Es wäre leichter, ein Buch darüber zu schreiben als einen Aufsatz im Magazin. Versuchen wir es, die sich darbietenden Gedankengänge in aller Kürze, mit Auslassung aller unwesentlichen Ausführungen, darzubieten.

Die Bibelkritik ist da und wird da bleiben, solange es eine theologische **Wissenschaft** gibt. Der Exeget, der Philologe, der Historiker, der Dogmatiker, sie alle sind gleichmäßig an der großen Aufgabe interessiert, den authentischen Bibeltext zu suchen. Es wäre im höchsten Grade unwissenschaftlich, alle Bibelkritik von vornherein abzulehnen und die Verbalinspiration der Bibel anzunehmen. Diese Position ließe sich nur halten, wenn wir die sichere Bürgschaft hätten, den Originaltext vor uns zu haben. Hätten wir, „si parva licet componere magnis," phonographische Schallplatten, aus denen uns „ipsissima Dei verba" entgegentönten, dann wäre der Standpunkt der Verbalinspiration nicht nur gerechtfertigt, sondern geradezu geboten. Dies ist ja aber nicht der Fall. Es gibt kaum eine einzige Stelle, für die sich nicht so und so viele verschiedene Lesarten und Varianten bieten. Darum kann ein wissenschaftlich interessierter Prediger keinen Text annehmen und ihm den Charakter „indelebilis" der Verbalinspiration zuerkennen. Es ist gar nicht zu reden von dem „Textus receptus," aber auch die vorliegenden Handschriften verbieten nachdrücklich dem Wissenschaftler, die Lehre von der Verbalinspiration anzunehmen. Und selbst wenn alle Handschriften genau übereinstimmten, und morgen würde eine neue Handschrift gefunden, die auch nur in einem Punkt anders lautete, — und man bedenke, wie ein Punkt aus einem Jod ein Schwa machen kann, wie das Jod und das Waw sich nur durch die Länge des Grundstriches unterscheiden, — es wäre sofort die Bibelkritik wieder da, und zwar mit Recht da.

Also die Bibelkritik besteht, und setzen wir hinzu, mit gutem Recht, und jeder wissenschaftlich gebildete Theologe muß zu ihr Stellung nehmen, wenn anders er Anspruch macht auf den Namen eines wissenschaftlich gebildeten Mannes. Denn, was ist die Wissenschaft anders, als das Forschen und Streben nach der Wahrheit? Und wenn wir als Diener **der** Wahrheit (Joh. 14, 6) die Wahrheit in dem Einen nicht suchen, wie können wir sie in dem Andern vertreten wollen? Wer im Geringsten unrecht ist, . . . wer will euch das Wahrhaftige vertrauen? (Luk. 16, 10—11.)

Es gilt also für den Evangelischen Prediger, zur Bibelkritik Stellung zu nehmen. Um seiner selbst willen. Unsre persönliche Einstellung Gott gegenüber wird wesentlich beeinflußt durch unsre Stellung zur Bibelkritik. Als die erste Form der Kritik, mit der wir uns auseinander zu setzen haben, tritt uns die Textkritik entgegen. Sie ist ganz entschieden durchaus berechtigt. Unsre ältesten und besten Bibelmanuskripte stammen ungefähr aus der Zeit des Konzils von Nicäa. Das sind also rund 300 Jahre nach dem Erdenleben unsers Heilandes. Wie unzählige Male in diesen dreihundert Jahren mögen die heiligen Schriften abgeschrieben worden sein. Wie leicht mögen sich da Irrtümer und Fehler eingeschlichen haben. Manche Notizen am Rand der Handschrift mögen auf diese Weise in den Text gekommen sein. Vgl. Joh. 5, 4. Ist diese Stelle echt, oder sagen wir besser, wäre sie echt, so wäre damit von vornherein unsre Stellung zur Angelologie entschieden. Ist sie aber ein verunglückter Erklärungsversuch eines jüngeren Abschreibers (zuerst in Cod. C), so hat diese Stelle uns gar nichts zu sagen und können wir dann ruhig über sie weggehen. Oder nehmen wir Hiob 19, 26. Was wir eben über das Neue Testament sagten, wird in viel größerem Maße von alttestamentlichen Handschriften der Fall sein. Und doch, wie viel hängt nicht von einer philologisch unanfechtbaren Kritik dieser Stelle ab. Wenn wir uns vorstellen, wie eine alte Uncialhandschrift aussah, in den krausen Zeichen einer längst verflossenen Zeit, ohne Interpunktion, ohne Vokale, in fortlaufender Schreibung ohne Trennung von Silben und Worten, so können wir leicht die Möglichkeit von Fehlern und Irrtümern einsehen, zumal wenn dem Abschreiber die Sprache selbst nicht sehr geläufig war. Man versuche es doch nur einmal, folgenden Satz zu entziffern: MNNGWRDSWRT (Im Anfang war das Wort).

Als zweite Art der Kritik erwähnen wir die, welche dem gelesenen Text einen ganz andern Sinn unterlegt. Anfangend mit Origenes, der jedem Schriftwort einen dreifachen Sinn unterlegte, den somatischen, psychischen und pneumatischen, bis in die neuste Zeit hinein, wo viele Sekten des **Allegorismus** pflegen, um ihren Fündlein ein biblisches Mäntelchen umzuhängen, finden wir diese Kritik der Schrift, als ob das Buch der Bücher nicht imstande, oder nicht willens gewesen wäre, das, was zu unsrer Seligkeit dient, in klaren, unmißverständlichen Worten auszusprechen. Diese Art der Bibelkritik lehnen wir nach dem Vorbild unsrer Reformatoren ohne Weiteres entschieden ab. Es gibt nur einen Sinn: den historisch-philologischen.

Anders wird aber naturgemäß unsre Stellung, wenn wir das Feld der Textkritik verlassen und uns in das Gebiet der „höheren Kritik" begeben. Was ist die höhere Kritik? Wir verstehen darunter am besten die Kritik ganzer Bücher, ihres Inhalts, ihrer

Echtheit, ihrer jetzigen Gestalt, kurz aller der Fragen, die in der Isagogik gewöhnlich abgehandelt werden. Als Vorbemerkung möchten wir zwei Sätze hinstellen. Nämlich erstens, daß die Bücher der Bibel nicht auf gleicher Stufe mit andern beliebigen Erzeugnissen der Literatur stehen. Sie dürfen vielmehr erwarten, daß wir mit Pietät und Respekt ihnen gegenüber treten. Und zum andern, daß Kritik **niemals** Selbstzweck sein kann und darf, sondern immer nur Mittel zum Zweck. Mit diesen beiden Vorbehalten treten wir nun in eine Würdigung der höheren Kritik ein.

Von vornherein ablehnen dürfen wir sie nicht, müssen aber anderseits sehr vorsichtig sein. Es scheint nach dem jetzigen Stand der wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnis nicht falsch zu sein, sich gewisse Resultate der höheren Kritik anzueignen, wir müssen aber daneben bereit sein, unser Urteil jeder Zeit der Prüfung neuer wissenschaftlicher Ergebnisse zu unterwerfen. Adolf Harnack, der bekannte Berliner Theologe z. B. war in seinen jüngeren Jahren ein Rufer im Streit der Kritik und deren entschiedener Vorkämpfer. Derselbe hat aber in seinen späteren Jahren die durchaus ernst gemeinte und ernst zu nehmende Forderung aufgestellt: „Zurück zum Evangelium." Um aus den vielen Fragen der höheren Kritik nur zwei herauszugreifen, so erscheint es mir, daß wir wohl mit Sicherheit von den Quellenschriften des Pentateuchs reden dürfen. Jedenfalls ist die Stellung der alten rabbinischen Theologie unhaltbar, die den ganzen Pentateuch mit Ausnahme der letzten acht Verse von Moses geschrieben sein lassen wollte. Oder die andre Frage, die seinerzeit viel Staub aufwirbelte, nach der Einheit des Propheten Jesaja, scheint z. B. in dem Sinn erledigt zu sein, daß wir einen Deuterojesaja annehmen müssen. Aber ich wiederhole noch einmal, nur mit dem Vorbehalt, daß, bei weiterer Entwickelung der Wissenschaft und bei neuen Ergebnissen, wir unser Urteil jederzeit revidieren können und wollen. Und noch eins: Seien wir vorsichtig. Vieles wird von der Tagesströmung als „gesichertes Resultat" der Wissenschaft ausgeschrieben, worüber in einigen Jahren man stillschweigend zur Tagesordnung übergeht. Freilich wird es den durchschnittlichen Pastoren ganz unmöglich sein, alle Behauptungen genau nachzuprüfen. Es fehlt uns die Zeit, die Bibliothek und das Geld, eigene Forschungen anzustellen. Unter tausenden wird kaum einer in der Lage sein, eine ausreichende Universitäts- oder Staatsbibliothek in erreichbarer Nähe zu haben. Es wird die Zeit fehlen, die zu solchen Untersuchungen notwendig ist; es wird auch an dem nötigen Geld zum Reisen und zum Hinundhersenden der Bücher. Es wird uns leider sehr oft nichts übrig bleiben als „jurare in verba magistri." Aber wieder mahnen wir: Mit Vorsicht. Daß wir nicht das Wort Gottes verwerfen und uns an das Wort eines menschlichen Professors binden.

So weit haben wir von dem Prediger als von einem Wissenschaftler geredet, der in seinem Studierkämmerlein die Wahrheit zu ergründen sucht. Es ist aber dieses Kämmerlein auch ein Pniel, ein Gebetsstüblein, in dem der Bewohner der Wahrheit im Gebet naht. Müssen wir uns also einen menschlichen Führer auswählen, der unsre wissenschaftliche Erkenntnis anleitet, so sei es doch wenigstens einer, der uns nicht hindert am göttlichen Erkennen. Es ist bezeichnend, daß bei vielen der höheren Kritiker eine klare dogmatisch-liberal gefärbte Einstellung ersichtlich ist. Wenn als Folge dieser Studien, gut und recht; wenn aber, wie leider nur zu oft der Fall, der dogmatische Liberalismus die Nährampe dieser Studien ist, dann allerdings: „Caveant consules." Lehnt ein Autor aus dogmatischer Voreingenommenheit das Wort Gottes ab, dann ist er es nicht wert, unser Führer in unserm Streben nach Wahrheit zu sein.

Jedenfalls müssen wir uns in unsrer Studierstube mit den Resultaten der Bibelkritik auseinandersetzen für unser eigenes geistliches Leben. Meines Erachtens nun sollte es keinen Unterschied auf das Gebetsleben eines Pastors machen, ob Moses oder ob der Jahvist oder Elohist oder der Priesterkodex ein Wort geschrieben hat. Wer es auch gewesen, **Gott** redet durch ihn. Und ob nun das Wort vom stellvertretenden Leiden des Lammes Gottes, das „Fürwahr, er trug unsre Krankheit" usw. aus dem Mund des königlichen Propheten oder eines sonst unbekannten Anonymus stammt, sollte uns nicht abhalten, in gläubiger Anbetung unsre Knie zu beugen. Gesetzt aber den Fall, daß unsre Studien uns dahin führen, daß wir am Glauben Schiffbruch leiden, daß wir nicht mehr als überzeugte Vertreter der Wahrheit auf die Kanzel treten können, ja, dann bleibt uns nichts weiter übrig, als als ehrliche Männer die Konsequenzen zu ziehen und zu tragen und das geistliche Amt aufzugeben, den Talar mit der Arbeitsbluse zu vertauschen, und unsern Lebensunterhalt auf irgendeine andre Weise zu erwerben.

Soweit haben wir nun von dem Evangelischen Geistlichen als von einer Einzelperson geredet. Nun aber kommt hinzu, daß diese Einzelperson berufen ist, ein Lehrer der Menschheit zu sein, daß er nicht nur für sich selbst den Weg gefunden haben muß, sondern daß er ihn auch andern, ihm anvertrauten Seelen weisen soll. Mit andern Worten, wie soll sich die Stellung des Pastors zur Bibelkritik in seinem öffentlichen Amtsleben zeigen? Kann und soll seine Stellung zur Bibelkritik seine Predigertätigkeit, seinen Unterricht in Sonntagschule und Konfirmandenunterweisung, im Jugendverein, in Sonntagschullehrer-Versammlungen usw. berühren und beeinflussen?

In der Sonntagschule nun wird der Pastor kaum je in die Verlegenheit kommen, seine kritische Ueberzeugung darzulegen. Mit

der vorgeschriebenen Lektion, die ja in der Regel auch die Behandlungsweise angibt, ist kein Raum für exegetisch-kritische Seitensprünge. Und selbst wenn je sich eine solche Gelegenheit an den Haaren herbeiziehen ließe, so ist doch die Schule kein Platz dafür. Es würde den Kindern alles und jedes Verständnis für diese Fragen mangeln. Alles, was man erreichen könnte, würde sein, in die Kinderseelen frühzeitig den Zweifel hineinzuzwingen, der dazu führen möchte, daß das Kind anstatt der Kritik an der Bibel die Kritik an Gott daraus entnimmt. Auch in seiner Tätigkeit als Lehrer einer Klasse von Erwachsenen oder Konfirmierten verhält es sich ähnlich. Es ist schwer allgemein gültige Regeln aufzustellen. Viel kommt auf die Zusammensetzung der Klasse an. Sind es gereifte Christen in vorgeschrittenen Jahren, so würde eine negative Darlegung der Resultate (?) der Bibelkritik zu weiter nichts als zur Zerstörung der Klasse führen, während eine positive Darlegung wohl zur Festigung der Seelen beitragen könnte. Anders aber wird die Sache, wenn die Klasse aus jungen Leutn von der Hochschule und Universität besteht. Da ist es sehr wohl möglich, daß der Pastor zu Fragen der Kritik, z. B. zum Schöpfungsbericht und der Evolution Stellung nehmen muß. Als allgemein gültige Regel möchte ich die Forderung aufstellen, daß der Prediger wahrhaftig bleibe. Er soll nicht eine Ueberzeugung heucheln, die er nicht teilt. Ist seine Ueberzeugung abweichend von der Kirchenlehre, so haben wir schon oben die Forderung aufgestellt, daß er als ehrlicher Mann das Amt nicht bekleiden kann. Zum allerwenigstens ist das durchaus geboten, daß er bei der Ausführung seiner Stellung es ausdrücklich und nachdrücklich betone, dies oder jenes sei seine **persönliche** Ueberzeugung, während die Lehre der Kirche anders sei.

Noch schwieriger wird die Stellung des negativ gerichteten Predigers im Konfirmandenunterricht. Wir haben da die Jugend in dem Alter vor uns, in dem sie zur Idealverehrung hinneigt. Können wir es über das Gewissen bringen, die Ideale dieser jungen Seelen zu zertrümmern um einer wissenschaftlichen Ueberzeugung willen. die sich letzten Endes doch als unrichtig erweisen mag? Und wenn, was haben wir Besseres den Kindern zu bieten? Der Prediger ist Gott verantwortlich für diese Seelen. Wie will er bestehen, wenn er niederreißt, ohne etwas Besseres aufbauen zu können? Uebrigens ist der Lehrstoff, den wir, oft in einem kurzen Winter, zu bewältigen haben, so gewaltig groß, Katechismus, Biblische Geschichte, Bibelkunde, Umrisse der Kirchengeschichte, daß wir froh sein können, wenn wir das erledigen können, ohne solche kritische Fragen, die für das Glaubensleben unwesentlich sind, zu berühren. Sollte es sich aber je ergeben, daß solche Fragen gestreift werden, so würde ich raten, lieber mit schonender Hand dar-

über wegzugehen, als ohne Not den Zweifelssamen in die Kinderherzen zu streuen.

Nicht viel anders wird die Stellung des Pastors im Jugendverein, Evangelischen Liga, Y. P. S. usw. sein. Das Material, welches wir da vor uns haben, ist in der Regel weder geistig noch geistlich befähigt, solche Fragen zu erörtern. Sie haben nicht die nötige Verstandesausbildung, und sind auch weder im Glauben, noch ethisch gefestigt genug, um solche Fragen ohne Schaden zu diskutieren. Sollte je die Notwendigkeit an den Pastor herantreten, auf eine solche Frage, vielleicht in Beantwortung einer Anfrage, eingehen zu müssen, so muß er sie nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen beantworten, muß aber zugleich hinzufügen, daß eine solche bibelkritische Frage unsre Gesamteinstellung zu Gott und seinem Wort **nie** berühren und beeinträchtigen kann und darf.

Noch viel schwieriger aber wird die Stellung des kritischen Predigers in Lehrerversammlungen, wie in den Lehrerausbildungsklassen. Da soll er seine Hörer instand setzen ihrerseits Lehrer der Kinder zu werden. Er soll wahrhaftig sein, überzeugend, aufbauend. Wir sehen sofort, in welches Dilemma die Bibelkritik ihn führen muß. Was soll er tun? Wir sagen: Er soll schweigen über solche Fragen. Wo es sich nicht umgehen läßt, soll er die Lehre der Kirche vortragen, wobei er dann, um der Wahrheit willen, aber gleichsam nur als wie in Parenthese, seine abweichende Ueberzeugung vortragen soll. Jedenfalls soll er es laut und nachdrücklich betonen, daß sie als Lehrer nicht dazu berufen sind, den Kindern, ihren Schülern, Wissenschaft beizubringen, sondern daß sie als Lehrer ihren Schülern wahrhaft gläubige und ethische Wegweiser zum Reich Gottes sein sollen. Diese Forderung aber wird nicht durch biblisch-kritische Fragen affiziert. Das schließt natürlich nicht aus, daß wir textkritische Fragen, wie die richtige Uebersetzung von Matth. 28, 19, Hiob 19, 25 f., die Echtheit von 1. Joh. 5, 7—8, die ja sowohl in der Deutschen revidierten Ausgabe der Evangelischen Kirchenkonferenz, wie in der American Standard Edition verbessert sind, erwähnen, dabei aber betonen, daß die Uebersetzungen als Menschenwerk auch dem Irrtum unterworfen waren, wodurch aber unsre Glaubensstellung nicht beeinflußt wird. „Ceterum censeo“: Alle diese Fragen gehören vor ein Forum von Gelehrten, nicht vor die Gemeinde.

Damit wird nun gleich unsre Stellung angedeutet zu der Frage: Wie sind die Fragen der biblischen Kritik auf der Gemeindekanzel zu behandeln? Haben sie ein Recht darauf, in der Predigt gehört zu werden? Ich muß persönlich gestehen, daß ich es nie habe begreifen können, wie Prediger ihr Zeugnis von Christo mit allerlei, angeblich wissenschaftlichen, Krimskram ausschmücken mögen. Jawohl wir wissen es alle, daß der Gottesname nicht Jehovah

ausgesprochen wird, sondern Jahve. Aber wie ein Prediger von Jahve auf der Kanzel reden kann, oder wenn er ganz „wissenschaftlich belastet" erscheinen will, sogar von Jachve, das ist mir einfach unbegreiflich. Ebenso in der deutschen Predigt vom Evangelium „nach Matthäus" zu reden, ist unsinnig. Im Englischen ist das anders, weil alle Bibelausgaben haben: „Gospel according to Matthew." Ich wiederhole noch einmal: Die Kanzel ist kein Katheder. Das Zeugnis von Christo keine bibelkritische Vorlesung. Im übrigen liegt auch keine Notwendigkeit für solche bibelkritische Bemerkungen vor. Hält sich der Prediger an die Perikopen der alten Kirche, so liegt mit Ausnahme des Evangeliums für den Himmelfahrtstag kein einziger Text vor, der kritisch als unecht anfechtbar wäre. In der Epistel für Quasimodogeniti kann man sich durch stillschweigende Auslassung des unechten Verses leicht helfen. Anders aber mit Mark. 16, 9—20. Sind wir zu der Ueberzeugung gekommen, die jetzt allgemein angenommen wird, daß der ganze Abschnitt nicht von Markus, sondern von Aristion, einem der 70, herrührt, so ist die Frage: Was sollen wir tun? Am Ende ist Aristion, ein persönlicher Schüler Jesu Christi, eine genau so glaubwürdige Quelle als Markus, der „Dolmetscher Petri." Wollen wir aber nur unzweifelhaft echte Bibeltexte unsrer Predigt zu Grunde legen, so bleibt uns nichts anders übrig, als einen andern Text zu nehmen. Jedenfalls nicht eine kritische Erörterung auf der Kanzel vornehmen. Predigen wir aber, wie wohl jetzt meist geschieht, über freie Texte, und wir geraten an einen solchen, unsers Erachtens unechten, Text, so ist der Ausweg ja sehr leicht. Um der Wahrheit willen lassen wir eben einen solchen Text beiseite. Dann allerdings müssen wir die Forderung an den Prediger stellen, daß er nicht predige über Dinge und Worte, die er nicht selber ehrlich vertreten kann. Sonst könnten wir ja auch über Goethes Faust oder Schillers Glocke predigen.

Fassen wir zusammen: Die Bibelkritik ist wohl berechtigt für des Predigers wissenschaftliche Bildung, hat aber kein Recht darauf, der Gemeinde vorgelegt zu werden. Sonst würden wir uns den Vorwurf des Propheten Jeremia zuziehen: Mein Volk tut eine zwiefache Sünde: Mich, die lebendige Quelle, verlassen sie und machen ihnen hie und da ausgehauene Brunnen, die doch löcherig sind und kein Wasser geben. (Jer. 2, 13.)

EDITORIALS

EVANGELICALS AND REFORMED UNITING

When the July issue of the "Magazine" makes its appearance the union between the Reformed and the Evangelicals will be an established fact. So this is our last chance to consider what we hope and expect will result from the merger, before the "marriage" is concluded. What mutual benefits can the two Churches derive from their organic union?

It was in 1908 (or 1909), in Zanesville, Ohio, that the oldest Presbyerian church of the city celebrated its hundredth anniversary. The ministers of all the other Protestant churches were present at the occasion and voiced their felicitations and good wishes. When my turn came I said the real human father of Presbyterianism was the great Reformer John Calvin; for John Knox who introduced the Presbyterian system in Scotland, whence it came to America, was a devoted pupil of Calvin. When I was in Geneva, Switzerland, I went on to say, I looked for his monument in the cemetery where he was buried, and found only a small headstone with his initials, "J. C.", carved thereon. But, I said, Calvin did not need a monument of stone or marble: every Presbyterian church in the country was a living monument of his life-work.—So far, so good—But now I began to venture on dangerous ground. I said we Evangelicals looked upon Luther rather than Calvin as our spiritual ancestor. Luther was a man of larger caliber than even Calvin. But in a certain, very important way, we needed Calvin, too. Luther had stressed faith over against works. Calvin had put the emphasis on works as the necessary fruit of faith, also. And the Reformed Church had learned from him to develop a Christian ethics, this development being already foreshadowed in the Heidelberg Catechism, whose third part deals with "Man's Gratitude."

After I had spoken, the Lutheran pastor took the floor. He was a member of the United Lutheran Church, which is not so exclusive as the Missourians. Nevertheless, he became quite heated and personal. He said he was surprised that a man who was educated in German universities could be so mistaken as to Luther's theology. Had not Luther taught at all times that the Christian faith was a mighty, living thing that would produce good works spontaneously? How, then, could I claim his teaching needed to be supplemented by the ethical emphasis of Calvin?

Of course, the man, in spite of his lack of manners, was right in regard to Luther. I had been thinking rather of the post-reformation Lutheranism when controversial theology made the pulpit the battle ground for the champions of orthodoxy and every one who deviated in the slightest from the Book of Concord was condemned to the everlasting fire.

The Lutherans in our country have perpetuated this attitude in so far as they put on doctrines a weight they cannot bear. They say life is always imperfect but the doctrines are the deposit of the spirit of truth. They rest on divine revelation and must be kept intact. Any union, therefore, between Lutherans and those who differ from them in points of doctrine, is out of the question. Walther, the great Lutheran protagonist, called the unionism of the Evangelicals a work of the devil and damned them in the most scandalous terms.

Well, some Lutheran bodies are not so extreme in their confessionalism as the Missourians, but even the most reasonable would refuse—and have refused—to unite with the Evangelicals unless the latter wanted to accept, at least in point of the Lord's Supper, the Lutheran position. Therefore, our union with the Reformed was the logical outcome of the situation. Our Lutheranism has always been of the mild type, and our younger clergy are not Lutherans at all, they cannot see any reason why a difference of view on the Lord's Supper should be a ground for division. The same is true of the Reformed. They are also—at least the great majority—of the mild and adaptable sort on the *distinctive* points of doctrine. They know that in Germany Reformed and Lutherans have been worshipping a long time at the same altar, in the same organized communion. We trust they are just as ready for this adventure of faith as the Evangelicals are who had the union plank in their original charter and believed in the old slogan: "in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas."

Under these circumstances the two Churches ought to derive mutual benefit from their union. The Lord's Supper was a point where Luther and Zwingli already disagreed. Calvin's position was much closer to Luther's than Zwingli's had been. He believed in it as a means of grace and in the spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ. To the Reformed it was always a *mysterium tremendum*: one should not partake of it without a serious searching of self and without due preparation. As a result the Reformed communed more rarely and it was emphasized that it should not be made a mere custom to which everybody should conform who goes to church. The Lutherans are apt to make it more frequent and expect every churchgoer to be a participant. In our Evangelical churches it is becoming customary to invite the organizations to

come to the Lord's Table in a body, have "corporate communion." To the writer that is just the way to make the Lord's Supper mean nothing but a formality. In large churches we are also introducing the custom of having the people stay in their seats and of the board members distributing the "elements" (of bread and wine). As a consequence nearly everybody in church partakes of it, because no one wants to refuse to take as the deacons pass around the tray. It saves time but it makes involuntary hypocrites of some. Coming forward to the altar and communing there takes longer but it means more. If the Reformed can *communicate to us some of the "mysterium tremendum" spirit* the editor would consider it a *spiritual gain.*

It is doubtful whether the Evangelicals today put less stress on the outworkings of faith than the Reformed. All churches have for at least twenty-five years been concerned with the development of a *social ethics.* The Lutherans of the stricter sort are the only exception. They are keeping true to the Lutheran tradition in the mother country. German Lutheranism has produced great "dogmatic" theologians, but on social ethics they have not advanced appreciably. Our younger clergy are strong supporters of the Social Gospel. In that respect, we believe, the Reformed and our Church are breathing the same atmosphere. And yet we are somewhat *disturbed in our social gospel enthusiasm.* The one who has done the disturbing is *Karl Barth,* a son of Reformed Switzerland. He tells us that with all our social programs we are not building the Kingdom of God. To do this is God's part alone. I imagine that both of our Churches are not a little puzzled in this respect. We had believed in the immanence of God, that God was in these movements rather decidedly; and now Barth comes telling us that God is wholly transcendent. Well, it is a good thing to stop talking so glibly of advancing the Kingdom of God, but then doesn't God use us as his instruments?

Another thing or phase where the Reformed have made a great contribution to the Church is their emphasis on the *constitution* of the church. Luther believed if only the gospel was preached and the sacraments were duly administered, all would be well. The constitution of the Church was a matter of minor importance. He allowed the princes to assume the position of "summi episcopi" ("Notbischöfe," emergency bishops). The Church became a State-institution. Hitler (or Goering) would not treat the German Church today in such a highhanded way if it had had a long tradition of institutional independence.

Calvin made the Church independent. In fact, his republic was a theocracy, the State ruled by the church. And the countries

which adopted the Reformed system all over the world, allowed the Church to have its own constitution, its officers, its independence. State churches are naturally upholders of the status quo. In times of revolution they share the fate of the State. They are held in part responsible for the injustices of the status quo. The laboring classes have never shown such hostility against the free Churches as against Churches in close alliance with the State.

Of course, today, in America we all believe in a free Church in a free State. The danger of conflicting with the State is remote, except in the eventuality of a war. Should a war occur again, most of us would succumb to the war propaganda in spite of what we say now.

There are quite a few other things where our churches could derive mutual benefit. But it is time to stop here, leaving it for the future and future contributors to point out the lessons of cooperative experience.

THE CRISIS IN CHRISTIANITY

The other night we had the privilege here of listening to an address by Mr. Clayton Morrison, the Editor of the "Christian Century," on the "Crisis in Christianity." We saw in the bulletin that this was going to be the subject of the speaker and while waiting for the sermon we revolved in our mind what, in his opinion, this crisis was going to be and how he was going to meet it. We had, in the preceding week, read a good deal about the "Theology of Crisis" in a recent book by Dr. Lowrie, the Episcopalian. Of course, every one, even if he knows nothing else about it, knows that that is the theology fathered by Karl Barth. I have been trying for some time to get better acquainted with this theology and I hoped that Lowrie,—who had been living for years on the continent and seems to have a great admiration and appreciation for Barth, would probably shed a good deal of light on the subject for me. I am sorry, and perhaps a bit ashamed, to say that he has enlightened me but little. What he has accomplished is this: He has emphasized the fact again, that Barth's fundamental principle is the "qualitative difference between God and man. Man is on this side and God on the other, and there is no way from man to God but only from God to man. That is not much gained, perhaps, since I had known this cardinal principle before, but it served to remind me again that this is an aspect wholly new to the "American scene."

I was quite sure before Morrison had even begun to speak, that he and Barth would not agree in the description of the present crisis and in the way it was to be overcome. Already in the prayer

—an impressive prayer though it was— that Morrison offered, one sensed only too plainly the different attitude of the two men. He spoke of God as "the companion, the friend, who can be approached with the same natural familiarity as a human friend." I said to myself when I heard this, how little like Karl Barth!

And then he began to speak taking for his text the passage in Revelation where the revelator sees the fulfilment of the Christian hope in the triumphant fact that all kingdoms of the world have become God's and his Christ's. He said that we were living in a time when everything was in a state of flux, in politics, industry, art, education, morals and religion. Sometime ago he had been in consultation with six representative men of as many different religions, and every one of them had borne testimony of the fundamental changes that were taking place in the outlook and attitude of their religionists. This held true, the speaker went on, of Christianity also. The Christian Church had so far—at least up to a short while ago—always been concerned with the individual only. The *cultivation* of the *inner life* had been its task, the Christianization of the social order had been entirely neglected. This was especially true of the Protestant Church. The Reformation meant the religious emancipation of the individual. Conversion and regeneration were the chief interests of the Wesleyan and other Pietistic revivals. The Church had never tried to regenerate the society according to the teachings and the spirit of Christ. Ever since Constantine had raised the Church to the throne had she been a kind of favorite pet of the mighty. Capitalism was born in the Protestant world, and capitalists had always been the friends, deacons, upholders of the Church as long as she insisted on individual salvation only and not on the changing of industrial society. The Church had taught that her task was to change the individual and it was then for the individual to change society. She had not interfered in politics, in industry, in education, in internationalism, and as a result she had no influence along these lines and her voice was only feebly raised and most ignominiously ignored.

But now a change was coming, had come. About twenty-five years ago we came to know of the *social gospel* (I suppose, of course, that he reckoned the change from Rauschenbusch's "Christianity and the Social Crisis," in 1907). It created a sensation. More than that, it was the beginning of a new era. What had been overlooked or been ignored was now to feel the impact of a great social urge. Great areas that had never been touched to any great extent by the uplifting power of the Spirit of Christ, now were to feel its regenerating influence.

The liberal men and elements of the Church greeted the coming of the Social Gospel with enthusiasm. They saw the truth of the

message of Rauschenbusch and those after him about the ages of ignorance concerning the social outreach of the teachings of Christ. Since then the Church has learned much and, as far as her preaching is concerned, the pendulum has swung from the one end to the other.

The trouble was that these liberal preachers believed that if only the ethical teachings of Jesus were applied to the new and wider areas of human life, they would be listened to, become effective and, although naturally encountering a great deal of resistance, result in a rebirth of human society. This belief, the writer continued as he reached his climax, *was a mistake!* It was found that it is impossible to practice the ethics of Jesus in society and industrial life as now constituted. Christ built human life on the law of love, and human society, at least the industrial elements, are built on the acquisitive instincts, on the profit motive, or selfishness. *This* is our *Crisis today!* exclaimed the speaker with vehemence. What are we going to do then? Are we going to give up Christ? Or are we going to give up the ideal of Christianizing society? No, said Mr. Morrison, we are going forward with him; we are going to change society in the power of his spirit. It will then be possible to practice his teachings in the new world which we are going to produce as his followers and trusting in the soundness and efficacy of his principles.

Thus came to an end the speaker's message. The sermon was read, but well read; in the brilliant style of his diction; a little above the ordinary church-goer because of its literary finish. The analysis of the Church's individual-gospel period was striking though somewhat overdone. The concluding "finale" about our being capable of changing the world so that the law of love could be lived, was disappointing. He mentioned Niebuhr at one time, approvingly. Did he think of him when making that last resounding promise? If he did he must have known he didn't have him on his side. But whether he did or not, this writer was wholly unconvinced. We will never make a perfect world. We are just now bending all efforts to make a warless world and we see what a hopeless task it is. We are aiming at industrial democracy. Doubtless every one should lend a hand to make the world even a little better. Still when speaking of our own resources, even spiritual, there is little cause for optimism.

Haben die Juden Jesum gekreuzigt?

Die Frage, die in diesem Titel aufgeworfen wird, hätte ohne Zweifel besser in der Märznummer behandelt werden sollen, denn das war diejenige, die in der Passionszeit in die Hände unsrer Leser gelangte. Indessen der Gesichtspunkt, von dem wir sie heute erwägen wollen, ist ein etwas andrer als der einer gewöhnlichen Passionsbetrachtung. In einer solchen würden wir eine solche Frage gar nicht aufwerfen. Jeder Leser würde ohne weiteres sagen: Selbstverständlich ist Jesus von den Juden gekreuzigt worden. Von wem denn sonst? Die Römer führten die Kreuzigung aus, aber die Juden brauchten die Machtvollkommenheit der Römer, um den von ihnen Verdammten aus dem Weg zu räumen. Sie waren die geistigen Urheber der Kreuzigung.

Der Grund, warum wir die Kreuzigung Jesu in der obigen Fassung der Erwägung unterziehen, liegt in der Tatsache, daß der neu erwachte Antisemitismus das Verhältnis von Juden und Christen wieder zu einem brennenden Problem gemacht hat. Hitlers Aechtung der Nichtarier richtet seine Spitze hauptsächlich gegen die Juden. Durch seine Rassenpolitik hat er die Judenschaft der Welt in die Schranken gerufen. Und die Juden können sich in ihrem Kampf auf die Sympathie der Christenheit der Welt — mit Ausnahme Deutschlands — berufen. Besonders in unserm Land ist eine Bewegung in starkem Fluß, die das Verhältnis zwischen Christen und Juden zu bessern sucht. Hier in Cleveland fand vor einigen Monaten ein „Institute" statt, das dieses Ziel auf seinem Programm hatte. Die Versammlung ging von den jüdischen Führern aus, und die Sitzungen fanden in den jüdischen Tempeln statt. Mehr als zweihundert protestantische Geistliche nahmen daran teil! Die Darbietungen standen auf einer hohen intellektuellen Stufe, und die Beziehungen zwischen den beiderseitigen Religionsangehörigen waren äußerst herzlich.

Bei solchen Gelegenheiten heben die Juden gewöhnlich hervor, daß **drei Hindernisse** dem bessern Verständnis zwischen Juden und Christen im Weg stehen:

1. Die Christen haben ein sittliches Vorurteil gegen die Juden, als wenn „der Jud" ein minderwertiges, ja verdorbenes Subjekt sei.

2. Das Christentum sei eine „imperialistische" Religion. Es behauptete, die einzig richtige Religion zu sein, die alle andern in sich aufzusaugen berechtigt sei.

3. Die Christen behaupteten, die Juden hätten Christus gekreuzigt. Dieser letzte Grund ist der durchschlagende. Wenn Christen und Juden sich besser verstehen sollten, so müßten die Christen diese Schranken fallen lassen.

Man kann die Beobachtung machen, daß unter dem Einfluß solcher Versammlungen und der glänzenden Reden, die da gehalten werden, manche unsrer christlichen Brüder etwas knieschwach werden und anfangen zu überlegen, ob wir denn den Juden hierin nicht entgegenkommen könnten. Sie sagen, man solle wenigstens nicht so stark betonen, daß es die Juden gewesen seien, die Jesum kreuzigten. Das falle doch schließlich fast ebenso sehr dem Römer Pontius Pilatus zur Last. Auch solle man nicht vergessen, daß das Christentum aus dem Judentum herangegangen sei. Mit andern Worten, man solle das Gemeinsame betonen und das Trennende im Hintertreffen halten.

Unsers Erachtens ist das ein verkehrtes Verfahren. Wir können nicht ablassen zu verkündigen, daß Christus der Name aller Namen ist, und daß in diesem Sinn die christliche Religion das „imperium" in der Welt des Geistes beansprucht. Noch können wir entgegen den Tatsachen und dem einstimmigen Zeugnis der Evangelien die Juden von der Schuld an der Kreuzigung entbinden. Ja, sagen die Juden, wenn ihr das nicht könnt, so könnt ihr auch den Antisemitismus nicht ausrotten. Das erste, was die Anstifter der Judenpogrome zur Erklärung ihrer Judenverfolgung vorbringen, ist: Eure Väter haben Jesum gekreuzigt.

Dem gegenüber sagen wir, eine solche Auslegung der Kreuzigung beruht auf absoluter Unkenntnis und Verdrehung der Heilstatsachen. Nur blinder Fanatismus kann solche Folgerungen ziehen. Die Schrift und die christliche Kirche nehmen eine ganz andre Stellung ein. Die Sünde Israels und seine Verwerfung des Messias ist die **Sünde der Menschheit.** Israel ist nur der dermalige Vertreter der Menschheit. Hätten wir in der Juden Schuhen gestanden, so hätten wir dasselbe getan. An Israel kam zu Tage, daß der natürliche Mensch, auch der Kirchenmensch, ein Sünder ist und sich selbst nicht helfen, noch erlösen kann. Was Israel an Sünde tat, offenbart, was im sündigen Menschenherzen verborgen ist. Und wie an Israel die Sünde der Menschheit ans Licht kommt, so auch die Liebe Gottes, offenbart in seinem Sohn, seinem Leben, Leiden und Sterben. Christus starb nicht für Israel allein, sondern für die Menschheit, die in Israel verkörpert ist. Israel sollte der Menschheit die große Tatsache des Kommens des Erlösers verkünden. Aber es erkannte nicht die Stunde seiner Heimsuchung. Es verwarf seinen größten Sohn. Die Heidenwelt trat sein Erbe an. Israel seitdem, zerstreut in alle Lande, sucht vergebens seinen Messias. Es rühmt sich seiner Vergangenheit, seines Erbes, seiner Leiden, seiner Leistungen, seiner Lebenskraft. Es hat noch Moses und die Propheten; das Evangelium hat es nicht gefunden.

Vor Jahren, auf einer Ozeanreise, hatte ich in einem Schiffsgottesdienst gepredigt, vor Christen und Juden. Nachher fragte

mich eine jüdische Lehrerin, warum ich gesagt hätte, die Juden hätten Christum gekreuzigt. Ich war erstaunt ob solcher Frage, sagte ihr, weil es eine historische Tatsache sei. Sie erwiderte, das sei, was die Christen in Rußland zur Entschuldigung ihrer Pogrome anführten: „Ihr Juden habt Christum gekreuzigt!" Ich sagte, das sei ganz verkehrt, und dann gab ich ihr die Auslegung, die ich eben dargelegt. Es war ihr etwas ganz Neues. Sie war nicht überzeugt. Und so werden die Juden heutzutage schwer zu überzeugen sein. Aber es ist die Lehre des göttlichen Wortes, und es würde töricht sein, um der Juden willen die Wahrheit zu verdrehen.

Jedenfalls kann sich kein Antisemitismus erbauen auf dem Heilsglauben, wie oben erläutert. Das Evangelium gehört der Menschheit. Es ist Gottes Gabe, nicht Rassenprodukt, oder Rasseneigentum und Rassenprivilegium.

The Christian World

Reformed Interests in Central Europe

By Dr. Adolf Keller

Switzerland is by its geographical situation and by its participation in the life of the neighboring countries an excellent resounding board for the cultural and religious movements in a large part of Central Europe. It is, therefore, quite natural that the evangelical Churches in Switzerland feel deeply affected by the religious struggle in the German revolution. This is the more true, as in the German revolution a new aspect in the 400-year-old conversation between Lutheranism and Calvinism is becoming manifest and has its influence not only on the German Calvinists but also on the other Churches of the Reformation. At the day of Marburg, 1529, the last word was evidently not said, and the present discussion takes up this conversation where the Reformers left it 400 years ago.

The Reformed Churches, especially in Switzerland, cannot remain indifferent if our Reformed brethren in Germany, partly of Swiss origin, struggle against a tendency in the new Church movement which is trying to unite all evangelical Churches in Germany under an episcopal Lutheran government. Nor can the Reformed Churches in Holland, France and Switzerland ignore a sharper tone in Lutheran denominationalism against the Reformed faith, as for instance in the writings of such Lutherans as Elert, Schomerus, Hirsch and Stapel, the editor of an influential magazine, who declares that the Lutheran Reformation is the Reformation of the heart, while Calvinism is only the Reformation of the brain.

The struggle of the Reformed brethren in Germany is therefore largely our struggle, as it concerns likewise the Churches of the world. Scotland looking at this struggle will often be reminded of what the Moderator answered to King James when he said that there are two kingdoms, one of which King James is the head and another one of which Jesus Christ is the King. Karl Barth, a Swiss, teaching in Germany, is taking exactly the same stand. The struggle for religious liberty against the Aryan Paragraph, and against episcopal authoritative claims, has therefore found a very wide repercussion in all the surrounding countries, and not the least in Switzerland.

The Swiss Churches felt more directly affected by this development, as quite a number of Jews and Hebrew Christians left the country and went to Switzerland.

The Swiss Church Federation and other Churches dealt continuously with these problems. Trying to keep the way open towards a sister Church with which they had always lived in peace and close

collaboration, they refrained from publishing official protestations in the hope that the Christians in Germany would themselves struggle for the purity of the Gospel and the freedom of the Church. It was, however, made clear through the press and in other statements that the Reformed Churches are forever opposed to an anti-semitic spirit, which we hold is unbiblical, as well as to any attempt to subdue the liberty of the Church to an authoritarian government. On the other hand, it is left to the existing larger international organizations to discuss the whole problem in a fraternal way with the German Church.

This was the case in a statement of the European Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid, asking the German Church what they would do for the victims of the Aryan Paragraph, and whether collaboration from abroad was desired. Also the Universal Council on Life and Work and the World Alliance for Promoting Friendship Through the Churches left no doubt that the actual methods of the German revolution, especially concerning the application of the Aryan Paragraph, were looked upon with gravest concern.

The whole struggle has a deeper meaning for all Christians who take their stand in the revealed Gospel of the Bible. It has become clear in the German revolution that a religious or even a theological problem is in the background of these political struggles. In the conflict between the German Christians and evangelical Christians a problem has become manifest which is of widest importance and which is deeply felt in world Protestantism. It is a struggle between natural theology based upon the God-given elements of Creation such as the blood, the race, the State, and the revealed theology which starts with the revelation and the redemption of Jesus Christ. We are proud in Switzerland that a Swiss theologian Karl Barth in Bonn, has prepared the theological weapons for this struggle.

The whole problem as to how revolution affects religion and what the Church has to say towards the new State forms, is awakening a good deal of interest. The Social Commission of the Swiss Church Federation has taken up this subject and is studying, together with the Institute in Geneva, the attitude of the Church to the State. This leads us everywhere to a rethinking of the nature of the Church. The new Ethics published by Dr. Emil Brunner has therefore a considerable influence in this field.

The European Central Bureau for Inter-Church Aid made a great effort to raise interest and money, especially for maintaining the Reformed wing of the Ukrainian movement in Poland and for helping Russian Christians. In spite of a good harvest, famine is raging in Russia. The religious leaders are particularly suffering. The Reformed congregations have nearly been wiped out. Of 70 remaining Lutheran pastors, 24 are in concentration camps. Switzerland has raised more than 200,000 Swiss francs for the suffering Christian people in Russia, during the last year.

Geneva, Switzerland

Reformed Church Messenger.

A New Book by Dr. Niebuhr*

Among the younger leaders of thought in our country, few today have so large a following as Professor Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary. Many rate him very high among our major prophets and all regard him as a brilliant thinker whose ruling passion is social justice and who has a message which we cannot afford to ignore.

The publication of a new book by Prof. Niebuhr is an event, and we feel sure that his latest work, *Reflections on the End of an Era*, (302 pages, $2, Charles Scribner's Sons) will be widely read and will occasion widespread discussion. He tells us that the basic conviction which runs through these reflections is that "the liberal culture of modernity is quite unable to give guidance and direction to a confused generation which faces the disintegration of a social system and the task of building a new one." He demands what to many will seem a bizarre and capricious combination—*greater political radicalism* on the one hand, and *more conservative religious convictions* on the other. He admits that neither the liberals in politics and religion, nor the political radicals, nor the devotees of traditional Christianity, will be quite satisfied with his effort, and he admits in advance that he has little hope of winning any general concurrence to his views. He adds that his distinguished brother, Professor H. Richard Niebuhr, of the Yale Divinity School, to whom this volume is dedicated and to whose stimulating analyses of the contemporary religious and social problem he is much indebted, nevertheless "disagrees with most of the conclusions" at which the author has arrived. These frank and disarming acknowledgments help to commend the sincerity and earnestness of this provocative book, which the author hopes will help a little, at least, "to shake the easy faith by which modern liberalism lives" and through which "the actual and tragic facts of contemporary history seem to him to be obscured.

It is of interest to us to remember that the Niebuhr brothers are ministers of the Evangelical Synod of North America, with whom we are soon to unite; they would certainly be an asset of outstanding value to any communion.

One who holds liberals in such light regard as Prof. Niebuhr seems to do, is not likely to command the entire approbation of our friend, Dr. Albert C. Dieffenbach, Religious Editor of the *Boston Evening Transcript*. In a recent able critique under the caption, *The Perplexity of a Prophet*, Dr. Dieffenbach applauds Prof. Niebuhr's "brilliant, slashing and searching exposures of the passing order," and admits that "his mind is probably keener than that of any other man in America in penetrating the tricks, the deceits and the wiles of men in all the tangled social, political and economic affairs of the world." "He is", says Dr. Dieffenbach, "a remarkable person who knows what is wrong, and who has performed an inestimable service, but he is not a leader."

---

* We publish this review here, in part because our Book Review Department is full and in part, because we want to give increasing attention to what our Reformed brethren say.

It will doubtless be of interest to not a few of our readers to note Dr. Dieffenbach's analysis, whether we agree with it or not. It is his thesis—which some will regard as rather strange, because he is a Unitarian—that you "*never get to the bottom—or the top—of any human problem without the support of a theological doctrine.*" "Either God will work out this chaos into a new order, or He will not," says Dr. Dieffenbach; and "in the present crisis we look for a leader who will fulfill the principles of *an affirmative faith in God or in man or in both God and man.*" He recalls that the first Epistle of John said: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets have gone out into the world." The reason, according to Dr. Dieffenbach, why Prof. Niebuhr falls short of the requirement men make of the spirits is that he is "more involved by the immorality of the world and the evil forces in history than he is convinced that there is a power, whether in God or in man, good enough and strong enough to win out over the world."

Though some have called Niebuhr "The American Barth", he is not really like Barth and he is not doing what Barth does, adds this critic. Barth's idea of God is different at most points. With Niebuhr, God speaks judgment, does not bring love or transformation, is without mercy or forbearance. "Indeed, He has been frustrated in history, and the only salvation comes by way of disillusionment." Advance is by a kind of violence, which Niebuhr has made his central theme in his book, *Moral Man and Immoral Society.* Barth, on the contrary, always believes that God is more than equal to the situation and pictures the character of God to be like the character of Christ, "infinitely more than the best that has ever entered into the mind of man."

Nor does Dr. Dieffenbach find Prof. Niebuhr's views of human nature satisfactory. He is "a thorough-going Calvinist in his view of humanity, but he does not run true to Calvinism in his idea of God," for Dr. Niebuhr's God "can by no stretch of thinking be called sovereign either now or in any imaginable future period in history." He therefore finds Dr. Niebuhr to be a "prophet who hardly believes in man or God in the abounding sense of religious history, and especially of the Christian tradition," and he finds him lacking in "straight and complete thinking," because "his theology has not kept pace with his social teaching."

This, of course, is a serious charge, and you may take it or leave it, as you prefer. Personally, we can say that, in hearing and reading Reinhold Niebuhr, we have been stimulated to thought as few others have been able to stimulate us. We may not agree with his conviction that the "haves" in our society are so bad that the "have nots" will be compelled to resort to force in order to secure any degree of justice. And it will continue to be a bit difficult for many to see how Dr. Niebuhr's guarantee of "serenity and spiritual relaxation" can be made good for those who take his view of the task of "the ethically striving soul"—namely, "to embrace and espouse two partially incompatible and supplementary attitudes toward life", preserving "a decent balance between the ethical urge to realize perfection in history and the religious

need of reconciliation with imperfection." Dr. Dieffenbach thinks the difficulty is in Dr. Niebuhr's "muddled mental processes"; we are willing to concede that our own processes are, after reading these profound "reflections", somewhat confused.

—*Reformed Church Messenger.*

After Two Years' Experience with the Oxford Groups

IRENE EARLL

When I read "A Buchmanite House Party" in *The Leader* of January 27, it fairly took my breath away.

For I was at that Briarcliff house party myself. I received no such reaction as Anonymous received. Any person who goes into a mixed gathering of six hundred people, as that was, with the gim-me spirit or the critical, stand-offish spirit, is not apt to see the workings of the Holy Spirit. For the Holy Spirit is given only to him that asketh for it in love and reverence. Many went to Briarcliff heart hungry and seeking, and they received a blessing. As I did.

What difference did it make what kind of clothing the workers wore? There were all sorts of people and all sorts of costumes. Each one dressed as he or she would have dressed at home. Most of them were too dead in earnest to think about what they were wearing.

Did Anonymous ever hear of the committees who usually plan a religious meeting? Or that they are apt to open their committee meetings with prayer for guidance from God for His help in their deliberations? If so, then why sneer at the Oxford Groups for doing the same thing?

Does Anonymous object to the members of the Society of Friends calling each other by their first names? It is their regular custom. No one sneers at them for it.

Those who have had real spiritual experience in the Morning Watch, or daily Quiet Time with their Father-God, would never make fun of what is sacred to another. God seeks His children in diverse ways. It is not for us to criticize any of them.

For two years I have been affiliated with the Oxford Groups. At first I balked against confession, and do yet when it is carried to extremes. When I told one of the Over Seas Team of a confession I had heard, she said: "If that happened now in a meeting, the leader would stop it."

When you can go along the roadsides and parkways any clear night in summer and see dozens of automobiles parked with "necking parties" in them, why rail at a movement which is bringing those self-same youngsters to their senses, making them feel their uncleanness so completely that they are willing to right-about-face in public? There has been and is need of courageous, reverent people to uphold the standard that sex is a partnership with God for the bringing of souls into experience and growth in this world.

Confession, or sharing of experience, is to help others and to witness what Christ means to the one who is sharing. It is a test of moral courage. And it is entirely voluntary.

At that same Briarcliff house party, the young son of an Akron multi-millionaire with his wife led one of the meetings. He told how, with every wish granted that money could buy, life was growing more and more stale, as they "hit up the pace." Then some one from an Oxford Group showed them how to change their lives. He closed his boyish talk with the words: "And believe me, this following Christ and changing other lives is the biggest adventure of all." There was no "exhibitionism" in that speech. It was right from a new heart, a real rebirth.

Cold, scintillating, clever intellect will never draw young people, never change lives toward spiritual growth and the eternal hereafter. I thank God daily for the Mission Brotherhood movement just starting in our liberal churches. I would like to see some of these Oxford Group liberals joining to help the Brotherhood in their work. In the Oxford Group movement, there are all grades of theological belief. But you are told, if you try to start a theological argument: "We stand for no set theology. This is a life, a life hid with Christ in God. Our utmost for His highest."

The description of the woman's meeting at Briarcliff reminded me of experiences I had during two years when I was lecturing on sex hygiene and sex education in New York City. Many women are hungry for some one with whom they can talk over their problems. The Oxford Groups are trying to get a message into the churches of all denominations, so that every church may have an inner circle of consecrated members whose life experiences the pastor knows and upon whom he can depend to send soul-tired people that come to him for help.

There is too little recognition of sin today. The churches have forgotten it or slur it over. Unworthy, sometimes actually immoral men, if moneyed or influential, are often allowed to hold the most sacred offices in the church. Sin begins with the individual. It multiplies in society. So we get economic depression and all the evils that result from it; we get lawlessness, drunkenness, broken morale and defiance from our young people—there is no end to the list. But the Oxford Groups have brought thousands up short, and saved them for a better society. Their objective is changed lives which in turn become life-changers. It is time something should "center the thought of the individual on sin in his own life." Rightly directed, that need not lead to morbid introspection but to healthy effort to change evil in one's self and in others. I have been at two house parties and two "Schools of Life" of the Oxford Groups. I have yet to see one morbid person among them who stayed so. They will not stand for it. "Stop being negative" is a frequent challenge.

It is unfair to call the present movement Buchmanism. It has outgrown Frank Buchman. But due honor should be given to a man who dared to stand alone and start out alone to convert the world to

Christ, on the win-one method. At the first house party I attended, I went with a decided prejudice against Buchman. He was not present and his name was not once mentioned in a public meeting. From it all I drew this conclusion: "God is with the man who trained these young people for His work, and whoever sets up his petty little criticism is anti-Christ. By their fruits ye shall know them."

This first article is negative, destructive. The article which follows is thoroughly positive and constructive. I want to thank the author for what he said about rebirth. Forty years after I was ordained to the Universalist ministry, forty years of trying to understand the being born again, its inner experience came to me through this contact with the Oxford Groups. I have to use my intellectual training in my daily work, but something has happened to me—something I feel growing inside of me that is beyond intellect, the master of it, bringing a sense of soul-continuity stronger than I ever had before, and a surer faith in God. I no longer *believe* immortality, I *know* it as I know that two and two make four. And I have learned a little of the prayer-life of Jesus and why he said: "Except ye become as a little child, ye cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Pray as a little child—just talk out to God about anything and everything that interests you. Prayer to God is the only kind of prayer. The so-called prayer of aspiration is just prayer to yourself—not prayer at all, except as you tell to God what you want to be.

The Death of Archbishop Macarios*

By One Who Knows

This story, vividly portraying the horrors of prison life in Russia that resulted in the death of the Archbishop, was received through an important official in Church circles and the truth of it is adequately attested. The author, whose identity must remain secret, explains that many remain "under the yoke" and still face persecution.

All the names in this story are changed, but the story itself is true from beginning to end. Although the Archbishop has been freed through death from further torture, there remain still many under the yoke. And some imprudent word may bring to them torments not less than those described here. Therefore the name of the town has also been changed.

The year 1931 was beginning. It was the eve of Epiphany. We were on our way to vespers to the only remaining church of the town, situated on the outskirts at a cemetery. All the reality of Soviet life was concealed by darkness. Among the whirling snowflakes suddenly appeared dark human forms, all going in one direction toward the church, and it seemed that one was still in the old former Russia.

The church and its premises were soon filled with people. In spite of active anti-religious propaganda in U. S. S. R. there arises a new

---

* Published here to show the treatment of the Orthodox clergy by the Soviets and the heroic spirit of some of this clergy.

mighty outburst of faith among all classes. Many atheists, who used to laugh and to mock at religion, now return to church, seeking comfort and rest for their weary souls. The church is the only refuge amid all the ocean of sin.

At the church entrance there stood as usually the exiled clergy. Bishops, priests, monks in shabby old cassocks, driven into exile from all parts of Soviet Russia, stood in long rows, holding out their hands. They were especially numerous that winter. Released from prison soon after their arrival in town they were entirely left without any help and driven into the streets. Not being permitted to work, the State did not supply them with any food and they had to depend upon compassion. Having nowhere to live, even to stay the night, they walked the streets. The local clergy—that is, what remained after all those years of arrest and executions—with Archbishop Macarios at the head, helped their brethren, where they could, collecting warm clothes, food, even money. One could see them every Saturday and Sunday at the church entrance, begging for alms.

Archbishop Macarios was officiating. He was a handsome tall old man of about 75, with long white beard and hair, who looked in his glittering gorgeous vestments a true Prince of the Church. With him were officiating several priests, the protodiakon and two ippodiakons. Alas, that was to be the last solemn and pompous service! After the reading of the gospel the Archbishop announced that no *Te Deum* with the blessing of waters would take place on the following day, as it was prohibited by the local Soviet authorities. His sermon was on the text, "The voice of one calling in the desert—come and prepare the Lord's ways." We still remember this peculiar atmosphere of peace and grace, that spread through the half-lit church. The same night the O. G. P. U. arrested Archbishop Macarios, almost all the local clergy, and three exiled bishops.

The Archbishop lodged in a private house. He had only one small room. At 11 P. M., shortly after his return from church, the head coroner of the clerical department of the O. G. P. U. (a former student of a theological college) with his assistant and three soldiers came to him. The questioning lasted for five hours—from 11 until 4 A. M. Naturally nothing was found as the clergy of U. S. S. R. never meddle with politics and are interested only in church matters. Archbishop Macarios belonged to those people who always keep apart from politics. He was perfectly calm and self-possessed during all the questioning, although he knew very well that independently of the results of the investigation his arrest was certain. Toward morning the police official came upon a morsel of the Sacraments. As a former theological student he knew that only priests are allowed to handle them. "Citizen Coroner," said the Archbishop, "those are the Holy Sacraments. The Church does not permit laymen to touch them." At the same moment they were flung with laughter down on the floor and the coroner began to trample on them. The Archbishop fell on his knees, trying to shield them and fainted. About 4:30 A. M. the Archbishop was brought under military escort to the Tuner Prison of the O. G. P. U., and the room

was closed and the door sealed (soon after into it moved a member of the O. G. P. U.). The poor old man had been already arrested many times before and he ought to know that in Soviet prisons there are neither beds nor anything else but he was so horrified by the blasphemy (desecration of the Sacraments) that he forgot all about himself and took with him only his episcopal staff. At the prison before being led to a cell he was asked to take off his episcopal cross. "As a servant of Christ I dare not take off His cross," replied he. "If you dare not, we'll do it ourselves," was the answer, and the cross was torn off.

He was led to a cell where there were only criminals. The O. G. P. U. often resort to that in order to frighten the clergy. But they are greatly mistaken. They expect to see the spirit broken, as a result of being among thieves and murderers. But the criminals behave very decently toward the clergy and the counter-revolutionists.

The cells, in which the Archbishop was locked, contained three bedsteads of canvas. They were occupied by seven prisoners. Five were criminals; the sixth was a worker who had, when the worse for drink, abused the Soviet government, and the seventh was a soldier of the Red Army who related that he was in prison for having refused to shoot people. (Later, however, it appeared that he had simply stolen while working as head-manager of a canteen. He had been transferred to this cell that same day in order to spy after the Archbishop; later on he contrived to steal from him all his linen.) The criminals offered to sell the Archbishop a place on the canvas bed for bread, or tobacco, but when they got to know that he had nothing they gave it to him without payment.

Archbishop Macarios was called for questioning after five or six days, and it lasted for seventeen hours, without interruption. It was conducted by several officials. During that time he was given salted herring without bread, but they refused to give him water. The coroner accused him of being the head of an anti-Soviet organization, that helped the counter-revolutionary element, the exiled clergy. The accusation was absurd, and both the accused and the one who accused, knew it. First, all the exiled clergy were registerd in th O. G. P. U. and had to report once a week. Secondly the fact that the Archbishop had a few times taken in for the night some of the exiled, who had else to stay over night in the cold street, could not be considered an anti-Soviet crime. As to giving them material help, the clergy stood at the church door and begged quite openly for alms and all who were able helped them. The Archbishop was then asked to give an answer in writing to the following three questions: (1) his view of the position of th Church in Soviet Russia; (2) What future the Church had, and (3) if he desired an overthrow of the Soviet government. His answers were: (1) that he considered the position of the Church very trying, but at the same time, as a God-sent grace; (2) the future of the Church would be glorious through the martyrdom of its saints, as in the first centuries after Christ. To the third question he replied that he daily prayed to the Lord that he should pardon them their sins and soften their hearts and cause them to relax their power without bloodshed.

Thus finished the first questioning and the Archbishop was led back to his cell.

The first three months of the prison life were easier in jail; prisoners were allowed to receive three times a month food and clothes from home, a doctor who visited the cells once a month, although not very learned in medicine, still provided the prisoners with the simplest medicines. The Archbishop received large parcels of food, being very respected and loved in the town, but he took for his own use only some biscuits, clean linen, and a piece of soap. All the rest he left to his fellow prisoners. He even tried to share with them the poor prison food, black bread, two teaspoonfuls of brown sugar, a plate of soup, made of fish bones, and some millet porridge, cooked with water, without any oil, or fat. Although old and ailing, he was still always brave and cheerful. He suffered his long imprisonment in one cell deprived of books, fresh air, and not summoned to any questioning after the first one, with a patience and high moral strength not to be compared with any of his fellow-prisoners.

The most demoralized was the worker; sometimes he was abusing the Soviet government, sometimes he was in black despair, crying and sobbing passionately. The criminals did not like him and used often to beat him, when the Archbishop slept. They consisted chiefly of very young people, who had committed crimes, having lost all principles and traditions, as a result of the present education. But the Archbishop they soon worshipped. By and by he began to talk to them about the Gospel, that was completely unknown to those modern heathens; in the nights he used to kneel in the darkness and to pray. Gradually his strength began to fail. So passed February, March, the Passion-week—when he ate nothing, but a few crumbs of bread with water —and Easter approached. Three and a half months after the first questioning the Archbishop was summoned for the second time. The same absurd accusation was repeated. The examining official shouted at the old man, pointed at him with a revolver, insisted that he should confess. "Your Eminence shall rot in prison until you confess." At the same time he offered to liberate the Archbishop, if he consented to enter the Secret Service of the O. G. P. U., but to no result. That was the Archbishop's second and last interrogation.

He was not brought back to the same cell, but conducted to a separate cell of the new prison building. Summer was beginning, and with it the heat. The white-washed walls, erected in winter, got soft and damp and were soon covered with moisture and mould. White drops ran down to the floor. At the same time all sending of parcels from home was prohibited, and prisoners were practically left without any linen, soap, or even food. Almost all had only one set of underclothes, as they had sent the rest home to be washed. Visits of physicians were stopped, as well as were the hair dressers, who used to shave the prisoners twice a month. That lasted from May to August. Into the cell where the Archbishop was kept, were brought five peasants from Little Russia who had escaped from camps. There was no place for them all to lie down. The air was thick with perspiration

of six unwashed human bodies, the odor of damp clay walls and of a stinking pail with excrements, that stood in a corner as one was not allowed to leave the cell except twice a day. Of ventilation there was none. One glass of water was given twice a day to each prisoner and the people suffered dreadfully of thirst.

They were so exhausted by heat, thirst, and lack of air, that they were not only unable to move, but even to speak, and they sat for hours in silence on the floor, leaning against the wall and breathing heavily with open mouths, like fishes on the shore. Their linen had mouldered and their bodies were covered with a few dirty rags, the hair had grown long. Lice bit under the skin and covered them. But the numerous fleas were perhaps worse. On the damp walls appeared fat white worms. Disease was fast spreading. Teeth fell out, arms and legs began to swell and to be covered with red and blue spots.

Some of the peasants, who were with the Archbishop, also fell ill. Their wounds, received in the war, opened afresh. One of them died, not having any medical help, and the body was not taken away until the next evening. To his place in the cell was at once brought a young boy of 19, the son of the deceased. The Archbishop, being old and stout, was too weak to lie on the canvas bed; he lay underneath on the floor, where the parasites did not attack him so fiercely. He hardly ate anything, but suffered dreadfully from thirst; but no one had, alas, the moral strength to give him his own portion of water.

Worms crawled in his beard, entered the mouth, nose, and ears, until at last some of his fellow prisoners took them out. From time to time he seemed to lose consciousness then he called out, or cried, but else he only prayed. Days dragged on, the door was daily opened in the morning, the bread rations were put on the floor. At last one day an exiled bishop was brought to the same cell. He heard his confession and absolved the dying Archbishop Macarios. A few days later the newly arrived bishop was interrogated. "Have you seen His Eminence? That is the way we shall make you rot too," announced the coroner. The Bishop refused to answer all questions, as long as Archbishop Macarios was not brought to a hospital. But his protest was of no avail. The death of the Archbishop had been decided upon by the Presidium of the O. G. P. U. At last he caught dysentery, which had infected one of the peasants first. The first days the Archbishop had heavy losses of blood, but in spite of the supplications of the fellow-prisoners, he was kept in the same cell. His fever rose. He was so weak that he could not move. At last it seemed fit to transfer him to the hospital of the town prison. He could not understand where he had come to and only repeated: "Please, don't beat." A few hours later he crossed his arms on the breast, murmured prayers and died.

News about the Archbishop's end spread quickly through the town. The clergy addressed itself to the O. G. P. U. with the prayer to let them bury the dead Archbishop. But their prayer was refused. A telegram was sent to the Attorney of the Republic, Catanjan, but no answer was received. Late in the night the Archbishop's naked body was buried without a coffin by the soldiers in the churchyard. Two women,

who had been by turn watching the prison gates, followed from afar. After the Archbishop's death there was a sudden change in the prison régime—food parcels from home were permitted, as well as ten minute walks, and medical help was given.

In the only remaining church of the town a solemn service was held for the dead. The church was half-dark—electric wires had been cut off in all churches of the U. S. S. R., and candle-mills had been confiscated. In the middle of the church stood the little table on which service for the dead is celebrated. On it were put the Archbishop's mitre, and tall wax candles that are carried by the Bishop at Church celebrations. All the church was decorated with flowers. Exiled priests sang the service. They began the chant: "Let us come and give the last farewell." And the folk came streaming to the vestments and fondly kissed all that remained of their Archbishop. Many sobbed and wept.

But that is not yet the end. The thought that the body had been put to earth without prayer tormented the clergy. What could be done? Summer was gone, autumn was at the door. One cold November night an old monk, accompanied by three persons came to the churchyard with a small lantern. They had taken with them the episcopal vestments, a coffin, and a spade in order to bury the Archbishop according to the rites of the Eastern Church. They dug out the body—which showed no traces of decomposition—clad it in the vestments, and after putting the body into the coffin, lowered it again into the earth.

The Living Church.

The Waning Belief in Heaven and Hell

Questionnaire Sent by Northwestern University Professor to Pastors Reveals Large Numbers Who Take No Stock in the Devil the Judgment Day or the Bible's Infallible Accuracy

Hell holds no terror and heaven no hope for a number of Chicago ministers. Some of these midwestern preachers of the Gospel deny the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection. They do believe in God and that evolution is the method of creation. On one point the Chicago ministers are almost unanimous. This is that "People who belong to our church are no better Christians than those who belong to another."

That is a sign that rigid sectarianism is breaking down. But the expressed disbelief in the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith indicates that modernism is still creeping into the pulpit and that the Protestantism of tomorrow will not recognize the Apostles' Creed. That is, if these few pastors are at all representative of the score of thousands of Protestant preachers who will ascend the pulpit on Easter to proclaim the triumph of the Cross. For even the open disbelievers and the "doubting Thomases" continue to celebrate the two outstanding events on which the Christian faith is founded. To the man in the pew it is, perhaps, all very perplexing.

These findings are the result of a questionnaire sent out by Prof. George H. Betts, head of the graduate research in the school of educa-

tion at Northwestern University. Five years ago (*The Literary Digest*, May 4, 1929), Professor Betts sent out a somewhat similar questionnaire to 1,500 Protestant ministers, of whom 700 answered. Of this number 200 were students in theological seminaries. The majority of the active ministers still clung to the ancient tenets which had brought them to the pulpit; the majority of the student pastors doubted or rejected them. But all professed belief in God, and a majority of all believed in His omnipotence, that His relation to man is that of Father and that the idea of evolution is consistent with belief in God as Creator.

Is There a Devil?

Professor Betts's latest questionnaire was designed to show what the pastors think should be taught to Sunday school children. "There is no devil," agreed 54 per cent of them, and they opposed the teaching of doctrines based on a belief in Satan. On the other hand, 60 per cent said they believed in angels. A large majority did not want children taught that earthquakes, fire and flood are visited on man as punishment for his sins, and 80 per cent opposed the teaching of the conception of hell "as a place of burning." Forty-one per cent were sufficiently doubtful of the existence of heaven to ask that it be eliminated from Sunday school teaching.

As to judgment day, 48 per cent said they believed in it; 39 per cent said they did not and 13 per cent were undecided. Eight per cent expressed a disbelief in immortality. On one point all of them were virtually agreed—that God "runs the world." But 26 per cent of them denied the divinity of Christ. Seventy-two per cent believed that Christ was God.

While 99 per cent of the clergy questioned would have children taught the value of prayer, 95 per cent said they did not want children taught that prayer would help them to pass examinations if they failed to study. By a two-thirds majority the clergy said they were opposed to teaching children that "if we pray enough we shall be good all the time."

"Joining a church does not make salvation certain," agreed 99 per cent.

An analysis of the replies showed that Congregationalists and Episcopalians are the more modernistic in their views and that Lutherans and Baptists cling most closely to traditional forms of belief. All the Lutheran pastors declared their belief in the devil, and a majority of more than two to one said they believed in a burning hell. But 44 per cent of the Congregationalists, 45 per cent of the Episcopalians, 70 per cent of the Methodists, 59 per cent of the Presbyterians and 24 per cent of the Baptists declared they do not believe in the devil. As to a burning hell, 96 per cent of the Episcopalians said they do not believe in it, and this was practically matched by the Congregationalists. The Baptist vote was nearly fifty-fifty, while Presbyterians voted eighty-five to fifteen and Methodists ninety-two to eight against belief in fire and brimstone.

The Lutherans said they were certain of the existence of heaven. But 44 per cent of the Congregationalists said they did not believe in its existence. In this they were joined by 26 per cent of the Episcopalians, 35 per cent of the Methodists, 28 per cent of the Presbyterians and 22 per cent of the Baptists.

Concerning the authenticity of the Bible, Episcopalians, by a ratio of ninety-six to four, denied that "everything the Bible tells about really happened just the way it was told." Eighty per cent of the Lutherans, 63 per cent of the Baptists, 20 per cent of the Presbyterians and 9 per cent of the Congregationalists are convinced of the Bible's accuracy.

To those who ask whither Protestantism is drifting the results of this questionnaire may give the reply. For if the doubts and denials indicate a trend Easter will have no meaning.

Literary Digest.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mentions this Magazine.)
NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*

The New Church and the New Germany. A Study of Church and State by *Charles S. MacFarland.* New York, The MacMillan Company, 1934. 209 pages, $2.25.

The struggle for the "totalitarian" state waged by Hitler has been successful to an extent that seem almost miraculous. The political parties, so long the battle ground of opposing interests and antagonistic world views, were swept aside almost over night. More than that, the governments and institutions of the German states that had so long enjoyed at least semi-independence, lost their parliaments and were reduced to the status of ordinary "provinces." The general election that was to decide the people's opinion on the politices of the government resulted in a triumphant victory for the "Fuehrer." And all this without a trace of friction or opposition on the part of anybody.

Least of all was such opposition expected of the German Protestant Church. Church-men had with unanimity endorsed the policies and struggles of Hitler. Besides, the German Church, Lutheran almost throughout, had always contented itself with the cultivation of the spiritual life. The ordering of the public life was the domain of the state. The Church owed the state obedience here. The Weimar Constitution had indeed given the Church more freedom, but then the Church felt no love for the "republic" forced upon the land by Socialists. She would rather have tolerated a mild interference from the "Summus Episcopus" than no interference from a socialistic government.

Wonder of wonders, therefore, when of all the interests and organizations that might have objected to the "Gleichschaltung" of the national life, it was only the Church that found the courage to protest. Still, the anti-Semitism of Hitler, his heavy emphasis on purity of blood, on the necessity of making the race question supreme, was so opposed to the belief in God as the father of all and in divine grace, not human nature, as the door to the Kingdom of God, that Christians could not well let "Gleichschaltung" enter the Church. Remember, their opposition was not directed against Hitler and his state, but against applying his standards to the Church. The "Aryan paragraph" in particular, which excluded Jewish Christians from membership in the Christian Church and, especially, from places of leadership as pastors, was the bone of contention. Thousands of pastors rose in arms about it. It was finally given up by the Reichsbishof Mueller, but at once decreed back in force again by Goebbels, the representative of the

state. It is not only this one paragraph over which the pastors are getting excited. The interference of the state in the internal affairs of the Church, its administration and even its faith (in the Old Testament for instance, and its revelation value) is something they feel cannot be tolerated. Rather a Free disestablished Church with all its insecurity, than a church used by the state as a useful instrument for its policies.

The Church of the Christian world is waiting with breathless interest for the outcome of the struggle. The German Church is a part of the ecumenical Church. If the extreme Hitlerites were to be victorious the bond of fellowship between the German Church and the Church of the world would be severed. It is here, where Mr. MacFarland's book comes in. He, as a former executive of the Federal Council of American Churches, takes an ecumenical viewpoint. He has been familiar with German conditions for many years. And in October and November, last year, he paid Germany another visit, interviewing people in responsible positions on both sides of the contest. He tries to explain the situation to the outsider. He does his best to prevent a rupture between Germany and the rest of the Christian world. In his opinion it would be most deplorable and unwise to cut the table cloth between the two. If the other Churches retain their fellowship with the German Church it may have a favorable effect on the issue of the struggle.

Of course the ruthless treatment of the Jews is by far the most serious scandal to the sense of justice and fairness—not to say the Christian conscience—in the non-German mind. Also the state-absolutism that will not allow the Church to lead its own life and order its own affairs in an atmosphere of freedom. Fortunately the picture is not entirely dark. The German pastors, when forced to make a choice between fear of God and fear of man, have risen to the occasion. At this time (Jan. 25) seven thousand are among those who protest against the un-Christian elements of the government's policies and the fanaticism of the "German Christians." There are professors of theology who try to defend the government's anti-Semitism, like Wobbermin and Hirsch in Goettingen, but there is also one who more than anybody else thunders a no! to all attempts at intimidation and compromise: Karl Barth. The trouble is that his theology is so profound and his style so weighted with paradox that it is hard to convince an ordinary audience that he is an authority worth listening to.

The situation at the present time is still intense and full of dynamite. We trust that the government will see that it cannot use extreme measures against the Church without disastrous consequences. It would be a great thing if the opposition of the Church would cause the government to reconsider its anti-Jewish program. It is almost too much to hope, but it certainly would be suicidal for the government to try to penalize seven thousand pastors for their loyalty to conscience and faith. Mr. MacFarland deserves credit for the impartial and benevolent spirit with which he has dealt with this difficult and momentous question.

The Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels by *R. C. H. Lenski.* Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio, 1934. 486 and 471 pages, $4.50 net.

Again Dr. Lenski surprises us with a book of over twelve hundred pages, containing commentaries on St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels. He has preceded this with a commentary on St. Matthew and one on St. John, which we reviewed at the time, and with an interpretation of the Eisenach Gospels.

We then already expressed our admiration of the tireless industry of the author, of his love for the work and his devotion to the task of a scriptural exegete. We said that probably the Lutheran Church is the only one where such large-scale commentaries on the books of the Bible could be expected and produced today. It is perhaps also the only one where the pulpit utterances are so largely homiletical, i. e., expositions of scripture texts. All this we could repeat as we turn to the two commentaries the author puts in our hands with this new large volume. The commentary on St. Luke alone numbers 761 pages, closely printed! We doubt whether there will be a great many who will take this book and wade through its many hundreds of pages from start to finish. Reviewer used to do that kind of commentary study thirty or more years ago. But even in the Lutheran Church, we suppose, that is today done only seldom. Scripture commentaries are more *books of reference* now. When the minister prepares for a sermon he wants to study his text with the help of a reliable, faithful commentary. He finds that kind of book in Dr. Lenski's works. Lenski does not overload his commentaries with too much critical ballast. Still he keeps in touch with scriptural scholarship. We do not always agree with his exposition. For instance, in his treatment of the thirteenth chapter of Mark, which contains the Lord's discourses on the coming destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, he naturally is struck with the observation that the Lord, after describing the tribulation connected with that Jewish catastrophe, passes over immediately to the signs indicating the end of all things and the second coming of the Son of Man. Lenski will not admit that the Lord expected the end so soon to come, in other words that he was mistaken. Still there is his word, "This generation shall not pass until all these things will be finished." To get out of this difficulty the author makes this to mean: this "type of Jews" (unbelieving and unspiritual) will not pass . . . . We hold this to be an impossible exegetical twist.

In order to get the full benefit of the commentator's service, one ought, of course, to be in general harmony with his theological position and his view of the Scriptures. The Scriptures are to him inspired and therefore without error. Jesus was the Son of God and so it is out of the question that he should have been mistaken on anything. If he drove demons out of a man they were demons and it was not a case of ordinary insanity. The author is decidedly not of the opinion that we have no use any more for the term *supernatural*; that everything that happens takes place in a natural way even if we are unable as yet to prove it. To him the angels at Christmas were real

angels and their singing was real and heavenly and not only put there by the poetical imagination of later gospel writers. Jesus did not only perform miracles, he was a miraculous person himself. The "acids of modernity" have not been able to affect the spiritual armor of the author.

At times, his scripturalness begins to grate on our nerves, e. g. in the discussion of the parable of the Rich Man and Poor Lazarus: "The fire in hell was not physical fire but had the power to produce intensest pain. He whose tongue daily tasted the finest wines and most delectable cooling drinks now burns with ceaseless flame. Pitiless are the final judgments of God." No matter what the scriptural words seem to imply, how could one square eternal pains with the idea of a loving father, and what purposes could it serve to have millions of human beings in intense and never ceasing torment? Perish the thought! It is unworthy of a Christian conception of a good and wise deity.

So, here and there, we disagree with the author on details, but otherwise we have the greatest admiration for his work and wish him and it all the success he and it deserve.

The Sensible Man's View of Religion, by *John Haynes Holmes* with an Introduction by Stephen S. Wise. Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1932. 126 pages.

Mr. Holmes, the pastor of the Community Church of New York, is a man universally respected for his courage of conviction and his sympathy with the lot of the common man. As a religionist he occupies a very radical position. Stephen Wise, the great rabbi of New York City and a close friend, calls him, in the introduction, the "most religious of the humanists and the most humanistic of the religionists." In the first one of these sermons Holmes endeavors to give his view of religion. He says, "it is not God, for religion may exist, as it has existed, without any definite belief concerning the nature of ultimate spiritual reality. It is not the immortality of the soul, for religion may or may not be interested in the question of survival after death. It is not the soul itself, for at least one great religion has denied that there is a soul and has sought as its end and aim deliverance from all existence," etc. It is not necessary to say that reviewer disagrees with everyone of these statements.

The religion of the sensible man is, according to Holmes, that of an open-minded, tolerant, unprejudiced man. But as a realist such a man discovers that religion is as old as history, it has had a most remarkable survival value. It is as wide as humanity, a natural part of the experience of mankind. It is not a bestowal of God upon man, but was developed from within. It is man's vision and spiritual achievement. Religion in its essence is about the same everywhere. There are many religions, but only one religion. It has done much evil but also much good. If it has not conceived morality, it has endowed it with its grace. Therefore we must cleanse it from the bad and develop the good, but must not discard it.

Is the universe friendly? This question first raised in this form by Haeckel, is the title of another sermon. Man used to think the universe was hostile and he tried to placate it by sacrifices and prayers. Then he came to think it was friendly (ruled by a Father God). Science has taught us that it is *indifferent* to the fate of man. But at the same time, that it can be trusted in its processes and laws, and that it can be used for the good of mankind. Fire and water may be destructive forces, but they are or can be made the most useful servants of man. The world is ready to save us if we are willing to be saved. To a large extent man is now the maker of his own future.

In a sermon "If Christians were Christians," he says, in that case there would be no churches, no creeds nor dogmas, no sects, no denominations in the Christian world. There would be no anti-Semitism. If Jesus should stumble by any chance into a synagogue, he would find himself happily with his own brethren. He would be perfectly at home there (!) Race prejudice, nationalism, private wealth, poverty, war, etc., would all vanish. To a great extent what Holmes says here, is true. He forgets to consider that men will never be all Christians and that the world in which we live will never be perfect.

He is at his best when he lets the Unknown Soldier speak on Armistice day. "In the Sunday School we learned from Isaiah: 'And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks. Nations shall not lift up sword against nations, neither shall they learn war anymore.'

"That's what I died for or thought I died for; but look at things now. The same world now, the same armies and navies, the same insecurity and fear, the same hatred and suspicions and preparations for war, and the same superstition in the hearts of men that it is noble to fight and heroic to kill for one's country. Kill, mind you, not die! We soldiers were drafted by the nation not to die, but to kill. The dying was accidental, the killing intentional."

Holmes was one of the very few ministers who refused during the war to support the government. He would not let his pulpit be made into a recruiting station. He practiced what he preached even if it led to universal ostracism. Such a man deserves to be heard, and if we can't accept his conception of religion, we can give respectful hearing to his philosophy of life and benefit by the manful exposition of his humanism. His religion is a kind of pantheism ("We are part of the universal spirit, part of our 'oversoul' "). As often happens, those that are correct in their creed are shamed by the consistent living of those whom they would call heretics.

The Re-Interpretation of Jesus in the New Testament, by *Carl Everett Purington*, Ph. D., Professor of Religion in Adelphi College. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1932. 217 pages.

The author shares with many the view that Jesus must be reinterpreted to every new age. As the "intellectual climate" changes, so must the thoughtforms in which the gospel of Jesus is presented adjust themselves to the viewpoint and needs of time. He holds that

this conviction is substantiated by the interpretation of Jesus as found in the various books of the New Testament. Paul whose epistles are the earliest sources of the person and teachings of Jesus we have, differs in treatment from the writers who came after him. Each synoptic author varies his message according to the different audience he has in mind; and the gospel according to John is in an entirely different class from the Synoptists. Thus the New Testament itself suggests to us that he who wants to make a more effective way for the Christian message must re-interpret it in conformity with the thoughts and needs of his time.

Mark presents Jesus as the man of power, the "heroic man." Matthew's is the teaching gospel, the "New Law." Luke's gospel gives us the "humanitarian" Jesus, the friend of every class and race, of the downtrodden, the outcast. The infancy stories in Matthew and Luke are not literal facts, they are beautiful poetry, symbolical, of deepest emotional effect, even if oriental fondness for dramatic setting is well understood. The healing miracles of Jesus are in part explained by the influence of a strong personality upon the mind, and therefore the body, of a weakened, nervously upset and disintegrated individual. Nature miracles and the raising of the dead cannot by us be accepted as literal facts.

A serious lack of the author's presentation of Jesus is the fact that to him he is the teacher and example (the one who tells us "what God is like"), not the Savior. His life story ends with the cross, the manifestation of his love and the love of God, and his loyalty to his mission. The resurrection and later his ascension are things impossible of belief for us who have given up the idea of a "three-storied universe." And yet the writer admits that the disciples did experience something very great and very powerful. They came to believe that Jesus was alive; and on Pentecost they received an overpowering impression of the presence of Christ (which they interpreted as a coming down of the Holy Spirit). So we see the writer had to grant the irresistible power that in some way their belief in the resurrection exerted upon them, but he is unable to explain it in the way they did, in spite of their unanimous testimony, and in spite of 1 Cor. 15, and the place the resurrection fact has had in all Christian teaching and living.

The chapter on John's gospel is very interesting. The author is, the writer says, some elder, living in Ephesus. It is not a real historical source like the Synoptic gospels; still the writer firmly believed that he was giving actual facts. It is more a treatise on the "essence of the gospel," that it is light, love and life. The discourses are not Jesus' actual words; they are put in his mouth like the orations in Thucydides because "they seemed proper to the occasion." The fourth gospel is primarily a portrayal of the Christ of Experience.

The re-interpretation of Jesus the author has given is that of the liberal school. In very vital respects to us it is not a satisfactory re-

valuation of the Lord. Nevertheless what he says about the difference of viewpoint in the gospel writers is very good and helpful.

He suggests a new creed, based on 1 John 4 and Romans 8, stressing the love of God and the love of the brethren: beautiful sentiments, often proposed but in some way not found capable of displacing the old creed.

What Is Modernism? by the *Rev. H. P. V. Nunn*, M. A., St. John's College, Cambridge, London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: The MacMillan Co., 1932. 291 pages.

This book was produced in England by an Anglican scholar, one who sees in Modernism a menace to the Christian faith. In this country we rather avoid the discussion of such subjects as are suggested by the modernistic issue. Some years ago there was for a time a situation that seemed to threaten a parting of the ways between Modernists and Fundamentalists. But it was decided that it would be better to take a conciliatory attitude and not disrupt the Church by the taking of sides. Had we not so many other difficulties on our hands and was it not more useful to work together in bringing about a new social order, a better industrial system, the outlawing of war and the gradual coming of the Kingdom of God? So Modernism was, for the time being at least, ruled out of court and we left it to the scholars on the other side to keep up the fight for the faith "once delivered to the saints."

In the book before us this is done in a remarkably strong fashion. The author is not a Fundamentalist contending for the literal inspiration of the Bible; but he occupies a conservative position in Bible criticism and in the specific questions Modernism has raised.

Modernism, as he sees it, holds that the spiritual values enunciated by Jesus are a sufficient basis for the Christian religion. It teaches that Jesus by his personality revealed God (showed us "what he is like"). It believes in the elimination of ideas and doctrines that do not appeal to the modern mind. The slogan of English Modernism is not "back to Jesus," or "forward from Jesus,"—but "forward *with* Jesus."

The particular subjects treated in the book are indicated in the chapter titles: the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the Life of Christ, and Modernism and the Fourth Gospel. The task that the writer sets himself is to examine the Bible text and see in each case which interpretation of the facts has the greatest probability. Absolute certainty, he thinks, we cannot obtain; we must be satisfied with the most reasonable.

The Modernists, in their study of the New Testament, distinguish between the Jesus of faith and the Jesus of history. What we have in the New Testament is not all equally historic fact. It is in part the idealization of the person of Jesus that took place in the minds of his believers. So e. g. the events of his birth as told in the first and third

gospel are the "work of artists, not of historians." They are stories "belonging in the picture book" of revelation. Everyone knows how the lives of great heroes grow to superhuman dimensions when the hand of worshipful adoration begins to work on them. But when the "negation of the supernatural has become a dogma of all educated people" (Renan), we must strip off what is evidently the work of an overheated imagination.

The author shows that the story of the virgin birth originated in a Jewish community among people to whom the idea that God could have a natural son would have been an abomination, and that what Jesus later became seems to have a natural basis in what the gospel stories tell about his origin. Belief in it was general, no trace being left that Jesus was ever regarded as the natural son of Joseph. The argument of silence on the part of one gospel proves nothing. Preexistence of Jesus as taught by Paul and incarnation as found in John are strongly on the side of the universal belief. So we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the narration of the birth stories unless we reject them as being miraculous.

The writer then takes up the resurrection of Jesus. With great skill and thoroughness he proves that only a real resurrection of the crucified Jesus could solve the problem of how the Church originated. The disciples after the death of Jesus were completely upset. Visions, subjective (result of their excitement), or objective (wrought by the spirit of God) mut be ruled out as inadequate. Only a real coming to life of the departed Savior can explain the rebirth of their faith and the founding of the Church. What raised Jesus from death was not love (Bethune Baker), namely the undying love of the disciples for their Lord. Nor can it be brought against the resurrection claim that God does not interfere in the orderly course of nature. Without such interference the Christian religion cannot be explained. It does not suffice to look upon Jesus as a spiritual genius. Here is the universal testimony of the Christian Church in its youth. Of course, only faith can enable us to be assured of it. But such faith in the disciples was the *effect* of the resurrection fact, not the *cause* of it.

To the Modernists Jesus is first an ordinary man, who by the spirit of God was made the greatest of the prophets. So unique was he in his faith in God and love for man that he rose way above all we otherwise know of godly leaders. It may be said he *became* for us divine. The spiritual experience the disciples had of him meant so much to them that they read their larger faith into his earthly life. They put it in historic form and we have the result in the gospels. However, against this explanation we must set the epistles of Paul. They are earlier than the gospels; and in them we have a Jesus who did not become God but was the Son of God already in a pre-existent state. In this Paul's teaching agreed with Peter's (see Galatians 2). So it was not "faith truth" which we have in the gospels, i. e. the larger truth that revealed itself to the believers as a result of spiritual experience but historic truth, that produced such larger faith in the believers.

The difficulties that present themselves in ascribing the fourth gospel to John, the son of Zebedee, are very great and hard to surmount; especially the discourses of Jesus in this gospel are so different from the simple style of the Synoptics that many have claimed that they could not be attributed to the same man. But the historic, outward evidences for the genuineness of the gospel are very strong. Besides, "the difficulty of imagining an author who had at once the spiritual capacity to write such a book, the intellectual dishonesty to pass off the record of his own spiritual experiences as being a true account of the life and words of Jesus, and the cleverness to get his book universally accepted as such" are still harder to overcome.

The book is a strong indictment of Modernism of the French type (Loisy, especially), the English (Griffith, Major, Pringle-Pattison, Bethune Baker, Gardner). It is written very convincingly. The author has a preference for long sentences (we counted one of twenty lines); still its chief goal of attempting to show that the Modernistic view of the life and person of Jesus has no footing in the historic record, is splendidly achieved.

As we said above, the book with its tendency to crowd off the Modernists from the biblical platform cannot count on a very favorable reception in the present spiritual climate of this country. Nevertheless, we say for ourselves it performs a task worthy in itself and performs it consistently and successfully.

Humanism States Its Case, by *J. A. C. F. Auer*, Ph. D., D. D., Professor of Church History in the Theological School in Harvard University and Professor in the Crane Theological School, Tufts College. The Beacon Press, Inc., Boston, Mass. 1933. 154 pages, $2.00.

The author in discussing Humanism does not take sides. He lets Theism state its case as well as Humanism, offers some mild criticism, and in a closing chapter, entitled the "Future of Humanism," ventures the opinion that Humanism will slough off its shortcomings and one-sidedness and carry on its quest for practical truth in common with Theism. Their methods will differ but in seeking to safeguard the best and highest human interests they will be at one.

In painting the historical background, the writer points out that Humanism is not simply a recent product nurtured in the rich soil of American optimism. There has always been a Godward and a manward movement in theology, he says. In medieval times the Godward movement had crowded out the manward one; but with the Renaissance, the awakened interest in Greek civilization, the manward interest came powerfully to the fore. The whole development of Protestantism centered around God and his revelation to man. Its theology was framed sub specie acternitatis, as it were. The Rationalism of the eighteenth century proves the one exception, for it was plainly a movement in which reason came down from the lofty heights of theological speculation and interested itself in the human scene. The Humanism of our day and country shows its close relationship to that Rationalism. It shares its optimistic attitude, its emphasis on the supremacy

of reason and its neglect of the emotional. The interpretation of human experience is the primary concern of all philosophizing, according to Humanism. Man's own affairs are its paramount interest and it believes that he is capable to deal with them without the aid of cosmic powers. It can well understand how theism developed. The gods were born of human needs. Man in the battle of life felt the inadequacy of his own powers and so turned to, or groped after, those elements that he dimly felt were surrounding him. He invested them with the human qualities of love and mercy, he found the pattern for his over-beliefs in t he relationships of the family.

In course of time these human qualities moved into the background. Man felt the need of raising God above human limitations; he clothed him with omniscience, omnipresence and almighty power. As a result the Godhead seemed too remote to interest itself in the small affairs of man. So a God man was needed, a "second person" in the Trinity, who shared in the nature of the deity but at the same time, having part in the human nature, could mediate between man and God. The author follows this "humanizing" process in religion down to the intercession of Mary and the Saints, and finds its last phase in the development of contemporary Humanism.

Humanism is not interested in metaphysics; instead of pure being we ought to concern ourselves, it says, with the function of being. Philosophy, in order to be useful, should stay close to the source from which it came, human experience. Philosophy and religion run away from the field where practical problems arise. Let us come down again to where the Stoics could lead us and cultivate the love of wisdom. Ultimate Reality is for ever removed from our grasp, so let us be satisfied with definite, concrete, limited Reality.

Can man be good without God? is the next question. Is morality solidly based only on faith in God or can it be reached by human striving and the pull of human ideals also? Humanism concedes that faith in a God who over-rules everything for good and has the power to solve all problems, has done great things in the past. But such faith is only an assumption, it cannot be proved. So man is forced to rely on his own resources. And he finds that if he uses them fully he will be greatly surprised how far they go, although he cannot reach perfection.

Can Humanism be called a religion when God is left out? Not all Humanists disbelieve in God. Huxley indeed calls it a tremendous relief when the faith in a personal God responshible for everything is discarded. But taking it all in all, Humanism contends only that God's existence cannot be proved; therefore he ought to be put in second place. Man cannot draw on him for reinforcement in the moral struggle. Doubtless, says the writer, the Humanist loses in the emotional, in the field of worship. He cannot worship God, he worships only divine qualities, goodness, love, forgiveness. Since these qualities reside also in man, he really worships man, he is forced to self-adoration. He wants the effects of religion, but how can he expect them when the content of religion is so grievously depleted?

The "Criticism of Humanism" finds that it appeals to reason only but starves man's emotional nature; that it lacks the sense of sin, so conspicuous, heretofore, in all great religious leaders; that it is unwilling to admit the value of the "over beliefs." All it has to draw upon are the human resources. Will they help in sorrow, death, great catastrophes, long protracted illness? Will Humanism fill its churches? Can it preach a gospel of joy, victorious faith when it has no God to build its faith on?

The author thinks that Humanism in the future will develop a sense of sin, a greater cultivation of the emotions, a greater faith. It needs such faith so much for it takes a daring faith to believe in the sucess of its program. True enough, we say, but where will such faith come from? We are wholly unable to see on what such faith in a brighter, successful future of Humanism is grounded. It can only, in our opinion, have something better to look for if it sees the *fundamental mistake* of its viewpoint. Its chief supporters are the Unitarians. The Unitarians, although they can point to great minds and talents in their ranks, are only one of the smallest denominations in the country. They might find comfort in Goethe's word: "Verstand is stets bei wenigen nur gewesen." But with "Verstand" alone you can't build a church. It takes something more, and the Humanists don't have it. Professor Auer means well by them, but he can't give them what they don't have.